# THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES—VOL. III.—(XXXIII).—SEPTEMBER, 1905.—NO. 3.

## SCHOOL SUPERVISION—ITS NECESSITY, AIMS, AND METHODS.[1]

THE term supervision as applied to our diocesan parochial schools may be taken in a variety of senses. There is first of all pastoral supervision. Every parochial school is an integral part of a definite parish. The funds required for the erection and equipment of the school building are obtained by the exertions of the pastor. The pupils of the school are the lambs of his flock. If there be in the diocese a number of religious teaching communities, even the choice of the particular one which shall have charge of his parish school is generally left, at least in the first instance, to the pastor. Where lay teachers are employed, the pastor selects them from year to year. Naturally therefore and by the very constitution of the parish and the parish school in this country, some supervision of the latter is required on the part of the pastor or his representative. The nature of this supervision, how far it should extend, and where the welfare of our schools suggests that it should end, we shall consider in their proper place.

Secondly, in every large parochial school there is, or at least there should be, a principal or superior, usually a religious, who may or may not have charge of a particular class. We shall say a word on the principal's duties when we come to speak of Methods of Supervision.

Thirdly, our schools are for the most part taught by religious of various communities. Usually several of these are found in a diocese, each in control of a number of schools. It is not uncommon for the superior to designate a member of the community

[1] This paper, which appeared in last month's issue of THE DOLPHIN, is here reproduced, by request, for the readers of the REVIEW.

as Inspector, whose occupation is to supervise the work in all the parish schools taught by the religious of that community. The value of this partial or community supervision, and the manner in which it should be coördinated and made a leading feature of our parish school system, will also receive due attention when we come to treat of the Methods of Supervision.

Finally, there exists in not a few dioceses a system of general supervision, whereby it is sought to supplement the work of pastoral inspection, and that of the principals and community inspectors, to organize and direct the parish school activities of the whole diocese. This system centres around a representative of the Bishop and the School Board, a priest of the diocese, to whom is given the oversight of all the parish schools in matters that pertain to their general scholastic welfare. The main purpose of this paper is to inquire whether in our circumstances such general diocesan supervision is necessary; and, if it is, at what should it aim, and how should it be exercised.

## I.—Necessity of Supervision.

We affirm that this general supervision is necessary, not absolutely indeed, as though the work of parish school education were impossible without it. Good schools, and doubtless many of them, existed in various dioceses before there was any general diocesan supervision; they can be found where there is at present no such system. We speak relatively, considering the science and art of teaching and all that pertains to the life and efficiency of the school, as progressive, as always susceptible of improvement. That the work of some schools has given a large measure of satisfaction independently of the supervision here advocated, is no proof that the limit of perfection has been reached; that better work would not have been done, and done more easily and securely, if the zeal of pastors and the skill and devotedness of teachers had been reënforced by the coöperation of one who has opportunities of observing the workings of many schools of all sorts, and the trial and practical success of ideas that perhaps never entered the minds of the pastors and teachers of these particular institutions. No teacher, no body of teachers, religious or lay, has a monopoly of the best educational thought; it is not

always associated with fine buildings and large registration; parish pride, commendable though it may be in many respects, gives no assurance of its possession; the atmosphere of the large city is not essential to its growth. One will often find the soundest, the sanest, the safest, the best in educational life, as in all other life, in comparative obscurity, its superiority unsuspected perhaps by its very possessor. Whatever and wherever it is, it ought to be brought out, made known. It might make an improvement in the ideas and methods of many a teacher, in the management of many a school. It should not be allowed to remain in obscurity or confined in its operations to one school or set of schools. Real good things are not so common that we can afford to pass them by with a nod.

This argument for the necessity of general diocesan supervision can be urged with even greater force if we take into consideration the weaker schools in our diocesan system. We are Catholics. Our interest ought to be catholic, universal, extend to all our schools, small and large, struggling and prosperous, to those in the little villages and farming districts as well as to those in our large towns and cities. In fact the welfare of schools in smaller, struggling parishes, is often of far greater moment than that of the schools in populous Catholic centres. The faith of the people in such places is in need of stronger bulwarks; mixed marriages are proportionately more common; the children mingle more with non-Catholics; scrutiny of the Catholic school is more searching; the smallness of the grades and the poverty of the parish make it necessary as a rule for one teacher to attend to three, four, even five grades, and not infrequently less competent teachers are assigned to this difficult work. Can any one question for a moment the value to this class of schools, of association through a general supervisor and a general system of supervision, with those in more favorable circumstances? Shall we leave to their own slender resources, these poor, struggling Sisters who seldom have a chance to exchange ideas with their own, or with lay teachers of the local public schools? Shall we deny them the benefit of the sympathy, encouragement, advice of one who is well acquainted with the success and failures of others in their circumstances? Shall we allow them in their isolation to give

way to the reflection: "Well, we are of very little account anyway"?

Then there are the children and their parents, who are only too apt to place the modest little school in damaging contrast with a fine public school, with its complete staff of teachers, free books, and every inducement to pupils. It often requires all the known motives of fear and love, the decrees of the Baltimore Council and diocesan synods, and threats of denial of the Sacraments, to bring children to the parochial school in such circumstances. How can the pastor's arm be strengthened? What will help convince these parents and children that their little school is really equal, perhaps superior to the other, even though appearances are against it, give them a pride in it, and draw other children to it? The knowledge that their little school is part of a fine diocesan system; that it is just as important as any other; the sight of their statistics, their progress in school work, in the same column with those of the big city schools; the assurance given by the Superintendent himself that the boys and girls of that school are as good as any in the diocese;—yes, he may even succeed in leaving the impression that in all his travels he has met none so good in some respects; the understanding that they are following the same course of studies, taking the same examinations as thousands of other Catholic children whom they have never seen yet feel they are associated with,—in a word, the sense of fellowship in a grand union, the same sentiment in reality to which St. Paul appealed when he wrote to the Ephesians (2 : 19): "Jam non estis hospites et advenae, sed estis cives sanctorum et domestici Dei,"—"Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners, but you are fellow-citizens with the saints and the domestics of God." What will create this spirit; or, if it already exists in some degree, strengthen it, spread it, make it a large and important factor in the upbuilding of our schools? What, if not a system of general supervision?

This contention is strengthened when we consider the peculiar nature of the teaching element, the most important element in our schools, viz., the religious communities. As a rule, several are employed in the diocese, each with its own ideas of teaching, its own rules and customs, its own elements of strength and superi-

ority in some respects, of weakness and inferiority in others. They are all full of a praiseworthy zeal to excel; and while rightly tenacious of their own methods, they are generally not unwilling to modify them or adopt others, if convinced of the latter's superiority. But while laboring in a common cause they are practically segregated from one another. They may occasionally visit a public school, or gain an idea of their workings from friendly Catholic public-school teachers. They scarcely ever see the inside of a school of another religious community, or exchange a thought with a Sister of a different habit on subjects in which both are so intimately interested. Is this state of affairs necessary? Is it conducive to the advancement of our teaching communities? It may be, and undoubtedly it is, required by the nature of religious community life. It would be hard to prove that it is conducive to enlargement of ideas on a matter of so practical a nature as school teaching. How then shall we contrive to leave undisturbed the community spirit with all the benefits that it secures, and at the same time foster a healthy emulation between communities, make this variety that exists a source of strength not weakness, put each community in possession of the best to be found in the others, gradually but securely eradicate imperfections that must accompany isolation? We reply again, evidently by a system that will reach out and embrace all, a system that provides a means of intercommunication, an opportunity of comparing results, viz., general diocesan supervision.

Analogous to this reason is another arising from a condition commonly found in our large cities, viz., variety of nationalities. Many of our largest schools are composed of pupils who scarcely ever hear a word of English, at least of correct English, spoken at home. The teachers themselves, however well equipped in other respects, are sometimes far from proficient in reading, writing, and speaking the English language and instructing their scholars in its proper use. It is necessary no doubt for the children of parents ignorant of the language of the country, to pay due attention to the tongue, and the national and religious customs of their forefathers. But it is beyond dispute that their future welfare demands at least a fair knowledge of the language, history, and spirit of America, where most of them will have to gain their

livelihood side by side with those who have no knowledge of foreign tongues and little regard for distinct traces of foreign nationality.

The Church has assumed the responsibility of educating these children; their parents are as a rule most devoted adherents of our parochial schools. They are so eager in fact to have their offspring receive a Catholic education that all the attractions of the public schools are powerless to draw them from their allegiance to their parish schools, no matter how wretched and uninviting these may be. It is our duty therefore to respond to the confidence placed in us by this great and rapidly increasing body of Catholics, who will soon be such a power in the Church and the nation; to provide their children with all the advantages of a solid, useful secular training, while instructing them in the faith; to leave them no grounds on which they might allege hereafter the insufficiency of their schooling to better their worldly condition, and enable them to reach a more comfortable sphere of life than that in which they were born. Their future devotion to the Church and to the parochial school will depend a great deal on the esteem they will cherish toward both for having adequately equipped them in youth for their life struggle.

We do not wish to imply that this class of schools and those in charge of them are not making efforts to come up to the standard set by the demands of the country, or that we should look for the same rapidity of progress in them as in others that are unhampered by their difficulties. We desire simply to emphasize the necessity in their case, in their environment, with their limitations, their immense numbers of children, their inherited methods, their foreign tongue, of contact with the forces that have made other Catholic schools successful. Isolation in their circumstances means fostering of narrowness, antique methods, lack of incentive, useless experiments, slow and discouraging advance. By what means can much of this be avoided? How shall we bring these backward teachers and pupils in contact with all that is energizing and uplifting in our parish schools? By extending to them the benefits of general diocesan supervision. There are some difficulties to be overcome in supervising this class of schools that are peculiar to them; but they will be greatly minimized by prudence and kindly interest on

the part of a Supervisor who is vested with proper authority, recognized as the representative of the Ordinary of the diocese, careful to show himself on all occasions conservative, inspired by a single motive, viz., the improvement of the schools committed to his charge,—who is ready to make himself, "All things to all men."

### THE PAROCHIAL SCHOOL IDEA.

While thus tending to improve individual schools and classes of schools, a general diocesan supervision will give most powerful impetus to the growth in every diocese of what is termed the parochial school idea,—that is, a general persuasion especially among our Catholic people of the necessity of the parish school, an understanding of the claims of the parish school, and the validity of those claims. The propagation of this idea depends principally, of course, upon the persistent efforts of individual pastors, the evidences of excellence that appear to our people in their own parish school. But no one can deny the power of argument in an accumulation of evidence. There is an abundance of it to support our claims, but it lies scattered in a hundred places, and its weight will remain unknown unless some agency interested in more than one parish school brings it together for the common good. That agency, it is plain, is no other than general diocesan supervision. Not only the reports of the Supervisor, but his very visits to the schools, bring home emphatically to the people the impressive fact of a well-cared-for system of Catholic primary instruction; for a visit to a school is a visit to the home of every wide-awake child in the school. It is known throughout the parish before nightfall that the superintendent has been around. What he said about "our school in particular and all the other Catholic schools, and the thousands of other Catholic boys and girls in the diocese," is reported graphically and faithfully at home. The pastor's exhortations from the pulpit thus receive sanction, his oft-repeated contention of the merits of his school is confirmed by the testimony of an impartial and trustworthy witness; the faith of many a doubting parent is strengthened; the grand idea of a Catholic parish school takes deeper root.

To conclude our first point, it does not seem a straining of

argument to deduce from this last consideration the value of a general supervision to foster among our people that spirit of unity, or federation as it has come to be called, about whose benefits so much is said in these days. One of the most important of our common interests, viz., our school interests, is placed before the people more vividly, more completely, even though indirectly. The teachers and the children of parishes that would otherwise remain strangers are brought together, made acquainted with one another. St. Patrick's and St. Bridget's hear of the good work of St. Boniface's and St. Ludwig's, and all four realize that away out on the confines of the city St. Stanislaus Kostka's and St. John Canty's are pressing them in friendly rivalry for the educational honors. Apart from the effect this must produce on the parents, it should be borne in mind that in another decade these boys and girls will be men and women. Unite them now and the amalgamation of Catholic interests is well started. Keep them apart on the plan of "every one for himself and God for us all," and we will have the anomaly of unity of faith with selfishness of interest, national differences and prejudices, un-Catholic hostility unabated.

The necessity therefore of some system of general diocesan supervision to bring our schools to the highest possible degree of proficiency seems plain when we review the circumstances of our average diocese, of our stronger and our weaker classes of schools, the variety of our religious teaching communities and their separation from one another, the obstacles to the development of the school where the language of the country is imperfectly known, the power of a general plan of supervision to uphold the arms of the pastor, to foster the growth of the parish school idea, to unite the children of the diocese, and through union of the children promote union of Catholic spirit among our Catholic people.

## II.—Aims of Supervision.

We pass now to a consideration of the aims of diocesan supervision. In a general way we have already touched upon them. Supervision ought to aim at the highest possible development of all the parish schools in the diocese, in whatever pertains to religious and sound secular training. This general scope can be

particularized by examining the elements that compose the school,—that is to say, (1) the teachers, (2) the pupils and parents, (3) the pastors and the material edifices.

### THE TEACHERS.

The principal aim of diocesan supervision should be the perfecting of our teachers. Upon them more than any other agency depends the efficiency of our schools, and our success in bringing the Catholic children of America within their walls. We may find many a good school without a fine building or elaborate equipment, with a very small registration of pupils. But we cannot even conceive a good school without good teachers. While other causes help, it is the teacher that makes the school. Now if this assertion is true—and who will dispute it?—what a wealth of promise is held out to our parochial schools, what an incentive to all enlisted in the work of Catholic education, to labor earnestly and joyfully for its improvement! For we can say with perfect moderation that in the wide secular world there can be found no such material for the noblest and most efficient type of teachers as we possess in our religious teaching communities. God has placed no light burden upon His people in this country, to erect, equip, and sustain Catholic primary schools; but His Providence has supplied in the religious vocation the comfort and assistance that make the burden light, the choicest quality of material from which is formed the chief element of the good school,—the teacher. And the supply is inexhaustible, for it is produced by the faith of our Catholic fathers and mothers; it is a manifestation of that essential, perennial mark of the Church of Christ,—Holiness. The religious men and women teaching in our parish schools are the highest type of teachers, because they approach nearest to the Archetype, the Master who "came into the world to give testimony of the truth." Where can you find such dignified demeanor, such grace and piety, such close union with God? Where such motives of disinterested zeal, such love for the poor, as animate them? Where such industry, that regards even a moment lost as irreparable, that finds in every good act a step to greater eternal glory, that has helped them in a few years to overcome all manner of obstacles? Where such

docility, such obedience, which none can teach like him or her who knows how to obey? Where such singleness of purpose, such perfect seclusion from the cares and distractions of the world, which are the bane of earnest application? Where such laudable ambition to excel in everything commendable and make their schools models of proficiency? Where greater eagerness to learn what is best and safest in educational thought and put it to use? Nowhere! They are the heritage of Christ to His Church, to take the chief part in one of His greatest and most arduous works, the education of the young. They must be capable, they are capable of excelling all others.

Supervision therefore as far as it concerns our teachers should aim at developing these qualifications of nature and state. The office of Superintendent provides exceptional opportunities for this. He knows, and the teachers are persuaded that he knows, their powers, their difficulties, their success, their shortcomings, the exactions of religious life. In his visits then, in his letters private and public, at meetings, he can advise, stimulate, sympathize, prudently, kindly, firmly, opportunely. He can remove the cause of many a discouragement, explain many a misunderstanding. By his vigilance he can prevent the introduction of so-called fads that are condemned by the best sense of the day. He can do much to raise the standard of scholarship and teaching ability, use his influence to establish wise diocesan regulations in reference to gaining State or other creditable certificates, and by his prudence and firmness secure their general observance. As we have already stated, he can be the medium of communication between school and school, community and community, city and town, whereby good ideas and good methods will be brought to the knowledge of all. From Monday morning until Friday night, from September until June, and, if he wishes, all through vacation, he can find opportunities at every step, in every school, to make the yoke of our teachers sweet and their burden light, to make our schools the live, vigorous institutions we wish them to be, worthy of recognition by the State, ready to prove their right to its aid when the day of public enlightenment on the denominational school question dawns.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN.

The aim of supervision as regards the pupils and their parents has also been touched upon when treating of the necessity of supervision. The Supervisor ought to spare no pains to combat the incredulity which unfortunately exists in some quarters concerning the ability of our teachers and our parish schools to give children a secular training at least equal to any they can obtain elsewhere. Means to accomplish this will vary in different localities. We might mention in the State of New York the Regents Examinations. While possessing some objectionable features these tests offer at least one great advantage to our parish schools, viz., a common ground upon which our pupils can meet those of the public schools, and prove their ability to measure up to the public-school or State standard. It should be the aim of the Supervisor to make the most of this opportunity. By publishing the results of the Regents Examinations in detail, a stimulus is furnished to the pupils and a telling reply is given to the charge of inefficiency. In the diocese of Buffalo, and doubtless in other dioceses of the State, the improvement wrought in our parochial schools and their teachers during the past fifteen years by means of the State Regents Examinations is simply incalculable. After every examination and at the closing exercises of the year, the parents of the children, the friends and the enemies of our schools, are confronted, often and laudably from the pulpit, with evidences of capability in our teachers that are indisputable. There is no longer any ground for refusing to send the children to schools which, besides the advantages of a Catholic atmosphere with all that it signifies, provide instruction in purely secular studies that enable them to pass with the highest honors conferred by the State examiners. In other States a similar opportunity may be lacking, but the Superintendent may find other ways to bring to the attention of the people, Catholic and non-Catholic, the excellent quality of our school work. We must advertise in this age of advertising. We shall have to display our wares if we wish to draw customers. Our Saviour Himself commands, "So let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven,"

which latter clause may well signify in the present case, "and send their children to the Catholic schools."

It is unnecessary to speak of the wholesome effect which this grouping of results, this general display of the superior work done in the parish schools, has upon the children. They associate with the public-school children. They talk class, teachers, and examinations, and they ought to be supplied with ammunition enough to make as loud a noise as the others. Acquaint the children with the value and extent of their possessions; they will be proud of being pupils of the parish schools and become missionaries in behalf of them.

To illustrate this, here are some passages from a letter of a boy of twelve, one of a package received during the past year by the writer, from an excellent school in a small city of Buffalo diocese. The lad had read in the little school paper some statistics intended of course for the edification of his elders, and he wrote: "Dear Father, I had no idea before I read the *Record* [that is the name of the paper] that there were 25,000 children in the parochial schools of the Buffalo diocese. I am glad that I am one of the number. I think the samples of Muscular Movement penmanship from St. Louis' School [reproduced in the paper] are a credit to them. I wish I could write as well. I certainly have tried, but I suppose I must try, try again." And he concludes, "I wish we had a Catholic High School too, but we must be thankful for what we have." And he signs his letter, "Gratefully, John ——." It should be the aim of the Supervisor to implant in the breasts of all our children, this little fellow's sentiments of pride in the Catholic schools, of gladness in being numbered among their pupils, of gratification at the evidences of superior work even in one not his own, of ambition to equal it, this longing for a Catholic High School and gratitude for the advantages he possesses. Create and foster a spirit like this, and what may we not expect from the next generation?

### PASTORS AND SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

What should be the aim of the Supervisor in reference to the pastors? One word expresses it,—coöperation. Exception may sometimes be taken to the system of general supervision which

we advocate, on the ground of interference by the Supervisor with the plans of the pastor, and an inevitable clashing. No such eventuality is necessary where there exist an understanding of each other's office, respect for each other's good intentions which are ultimately the same, viz., the honor and glory of God, a reasonable amount of prudence and patience. Surely these are not virtues essentially heroic, or uncommon in the priestly office. The pastor should recognize in the Supervisor a representative of episcopal authority, and the Supervisor must be clothed with that authority and sustained when he prudently exercises it, or his work will bear but little fruit, his life will be unhappy. But that authority is given, and the Supervisor should ever labor to make it appear that it is given, "unto edification." He should be a builder not a destroyer, a help not an obstacle. As a rule he can carry his authority concealed in his pocket; he need not flaunt it. He may sometimes have to use considerable suavity and discretion. Why should he not possess them? He should not be concerned about parish regulations that have no bearing on his school work. He ought to make allowance even in that for exceptional local conditions. A pastor on the other hand should remember that the sacerdotal office does not *per se* qualify one to direct a school, organize classes, prescribe or forbid certain studies. He should never forget that while economy is necessary, the sort that takes children from the fifth grade and puts them in the third merely to fill up a room and give a teacher plenty to do, is ruinous to discipline and future progress. Care for religious instruction, discipline, attendance, sympathy with the teachers, interest in the workings of the school manifested by short and frequent visits,—these should be his aim; and as for the rest, the technical school work, his policy should be non-interference. The teachers and the Supervisor ought to be allowed to attend to that. It is the experience of the writer that where this order is carefully observed, harmony prevails and progress is made; where it is lacking, discontent on the part of the teachers and discreditable work are the result.

Finally, supervision should have for its aim the betterment of our parochial school buildings. Little need be said, however, about the duties of the Supervisor in this regard. The plan and con-

struction of our schools are matters about which he is seldom consulted. One of the most disagreeable duties of his office is to direct the attention of authority to such abuses as overcrowding of rooms or other unsanitary and repelling conditions. What remedy the defect calls for, and when and how it should be applied, it is no part of this paper to discuss. But since we are taking a general view of supervision, we may be permitted to suggest that, if inspection of school buildings is necessary, the work of doing it and reporting findings to the Ordinary, would better be left to a special committee of prudent pastors, say members of the School Board. Their criticisms and recommendations in such a matter would carry greater weight, and a frequent cause of friction between pastors and Supervisor, that renders the latter obnoxious and greatly weakens his influence for good in strictly scholastic work, would be removed.

## III.—Methods of Supervision.

Before proposing plans or methods of supervision it is well to call attention to the great variety of conditions prevailing in our dioceses; material conditions or financial resources, Catholic population and its distribution, geographical or territorial conditions, the supply of clergy for the work of the ministry, the actual and prospective state of the parochiol schools, the number of distinct religious teaching communities, the proportion of diocesan schools taught by each. We are one in maintaining the necessity of Catholic primary or grammar schools, but the character of organization and the choice of measures that will best promote their development must vary according to local or diocesan conditions. However, this wide diversity need not prevent us from striking an average and advocating plans of school organization that seem feasible to the majority, and applicable in the main if not in every detail.

### COMMUNITY INSPECTORS.

The reasons we have adduced for the necessity of general supervision as well as the aims we proposed to it, suppose that it centres in one person, morally one at least, a priest of the diocese representing the Ordinary and the School Board; but thorough, systematic work requires, especially in dioceses where the teaching

is entrusted to more than one religious community, subordinate or Community Inspectors, men or women of good judgment and practical experience in school work, enjoying the respect and confidence of their own teachers. The value of their assistance to the Supervisor can not be overestimated. They are well acquainted with the dispositions, the capabilities, the defects, the needs of teachers of their community, or they have opportunities of becoming so acquainted no priest can hope to possess. This qualifies them to give sound advice when to insist upon the observance of general regulations, when prudently to grant exemptions. The Inspector, not the superior of the community, not the school principal, above all not the pastor or assistant pastor, should be as a rule the channel of the Supervisor's special communications to the teachers, particularly when there is a fault to be corrected, a remedy to be applied. By this means charity and peace are consulted, publicity and shame avoided. Very often through the Community Inspector, the Supervisor will come to a knowledge of difficulties and misunderstandings inevitable in school life, which he is able to remove or compose, and of which he might otherwise remain in ignorance, owing to the timidity of the teachers. In large dioceses where it is extremely difficult if not impossible for one man to inspect all the schools in one year, especially if he gives due attention to other important duties of his office or has parish cares, the Community Inspectors are indispensable. Through them, if he has their confidence, the Supervisor can be at all times in touch with the general features of the school work. Without their help he must remain in ignorance of many things until he gets an opportunity to visit all the schools.

He should have meetings at times of the Community Inspectors. Their experience, their limited number will conduce to more definite and practical results than can be gained from larger assemblages of teachers, although these likewise are valuable. Such meetings will serve also to preserve a good spirit of emulation among the various communities, and help the diffusion of sound ideas. In a word, we believe that the Community Inspector is the most important adjunct to the work of supervision. No community entrusted with the teaching of a fair number of schools should be without one, and even when the opening of new

schools causes a dearth of good, available teachers, as sometimes happens, the general welfare requires that the Inspector be continued in his or her position, and if sacrifice must be made, that it be made elsewhere.

PRINCIPALS.

In a very large school a Principal is important, and by this we mean not the pastor, not the assistant pastor, but a Brother or Sister as the circumstances require, who shall give his or her attention chiefly to the oversight of school work. This may not always require freedom from particular class duties, but ample time should be available to visit the various classes and devise plans for general improvement. We can testify to cases of positively wonderful progress in schools whose discipline and work had been far below the mark, once a sensible, energetic Principal took matters in hand. The value of Principals' meetings presided over by the Supervisor need only be mentioned.

VISITING.

An important part of supervision is the work of visiting and examining the schools. At the same time we should like to give emphasis here to the assertion that the Supervisor is not and should not be merely a school examiner. All that has been said to prove the necessity and outline the aims of supervision go to show that the scope of his work is much wider and more important than travelling from school to school, spending nearly all his time and energy examining. It is pretty generally conceded that modern education is examining and worrying our poor children to death. Who will compassionate them and refrain from adding to their many anxieties, if not a priest, who from childhood to the day on which he was clothed with the sacerdotal dignity, yes! to the day which marked his passage from the ranks of the junior clergy, had to undergo with heart-breaking regularity the torture of examinations? The general semi-annual examinations and those of the inspectors and principals, the frequent tests of their classes given by the teachers, provide all the formal examining necessary. The Supervisor in his visits can gain whatever information he needs, satisfy himself concerning the qualifications of the teachers, the

progress of the pupils, the general status of the school, by something far less searching and laborious than an oral examination of all the children. His questioning therefore should be moderate. His methods should always be of an instructive and stimulating character. He should lay stress upon the fundamentals, even when visiting pupils of the higher grades, and never let pass an opportunity to impress their importance upon the children in the presence of the teachers.

It seems hardly necessary to warn against violent criticisms, strong denunciations. They mortify and discourage teachers who are invariably doing their best. Children report the incident at home, and thus carping parents are given an opportunity to slur our schools. If adverse criticism is called for, a word quietly and kindly whispered to the teacher, who we may be sure is already grieved at the poor showing of her class, will go much farther to remedy defects. "Non in turbine Dominus"—"The Lord is not in the whirlwind." When the Supervisor goes on his way, he should leave behind him the sunshine of peace and happiness, higher hopes and aspirations. His own future labors will be sweetened not a little by the recollection of many a joyful face, and many a sincerely uttered "Come again, Father."

E. F. GIBBONS,
*Superintendent of Parochial Schools.*

*Buffalo, N. Y.*

---

## EXPERIENCES OF A MISSIONARY BISHOP IN JAPAN.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following series of articles is from the pen of the Right Reverend Jules Chatron, Bishop of Osaka, in Yamashiro, one of the provinces of Southern Japan. Bishop Chatron has spent thirty-two years in missionary work in the island empire and has become almost wholly identified with the Japanese nationality, whose tongue he speaks with even more fluency than his native French. Indeed, to those who had the good fortune to meet the Bishop whilst on a journey two years ago in the United States, and to whom he quickly endeared himself by his unaffected piety, rare humility, keen intelligence, and excellent judgment enhanced by a genial sense of humor, he seemed to the Japanese manner born, having even taken on the Mongolian features, which fact he laughingly explains as due to the apostolic practice of eating whatever is put before you, that is to say—*rice*, when you live in Japan. Osaka, the residential see of the Bishop, has about a million inhabitants, and is one of the centres of Japanese culture and commerce. To this circumstance are due the

exceptional opportunities for observing Japanese manners and character which the Bishop here faithfully describes.

The following notes were originally written in French as reports for *Les Missions Catholiques*, the official bulletin of the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith," published at Lyons. The translation is from the pen of the Rev. James Anthony Walsh, Director of the Society in the Archdiocese of Boston.]

THERE is much misunderstanding among what is called our cultured people regarding the character of the Japanese. The traveller may observe and analyze their habits and form some estimate of their social conditions, their external modes of living. But few get into and know anything of the inner life of the Japanese people. Some writers have even denied that the Japanese have an inner life. "Look at their paper houses, shaken by the lightest wind. Everything passes there and is open to the broad daylight and to the high sun. Your neighbor, even if he is deaf, is witness of and intimate with the smallest details of your own life. Everything indeed is neat, everything is pretty, everything is of a gay, smiling aspect. The Japanese are a people of infantine proportions, infant prodigies, if you will, terrible infants perhaps, but infants just the same." This, in so far as it depicts the salient disposition of the Japanese as a nation, is, it seems to me, based upon a very superficial view; yet, such was, at least up to the war with China, the prevailing idea about the people of the island, as much in Europe as in America; and I am not astonished that to many there appears to be something of presumption in the rôle Japan has recently undertaken to play in the East, in fact in the world.

It takes but an attentive reading of the history of Japan to come to the assured conviction that for many centuries Japan has been, as a nation, developing a strong native vitality that promises much for the future of its people. Some will say that Japan owes its actual strength to Europe and America, that it has borrowed all from them, and that up to the present time it is only putting into practice the lessons it has learned. On this subject, I might recall the remark of a Professor in the University of Tokio: "The Europeans," said he in substance, "give us credit for being merely imitators, without any spirit of initiative or genius of invention. They treat us somewhat like monkeys (*sic*); let us ask them where did they obtain their own superior culture? The boasted civilization they have acquired after the lapse of centuries at great cost,

where does it come from? The Greeks were the imitators of the Egyptians, the Romans of the Greeks, and the Europeans of to-day have borrowed a little from all of these. We, in the past, have imitated the Coreans, then the Chinese, to-day we imitate Europe and America. Who knows but that we shall become initiators ourselves? European civilization counts hundreds of years of development. Japan has had barely forty years of foreign culture, but its turn is coming." This language may appear pretentious, but there is a certain amount of truth in it.

Rightly viewed it must be conceded that the present and future strength of Japan has its foundation in the native strength of its own people. That people, for a long time regarded as a nation of children and superficial, is in truth a people with a powerful tradition. Their education has been entirely traditional. This does not prevent them from appropriating to themselves what they find good elsewhere; for with them tradition does not mean a hindrance or a matter of routine, as with many old nations. Japanese literature itself is a literature which goes back very far; and a good Japanese writer or orator is understood to be one who has mastered and can use for his present purpose the old historical and literary models.

It has often been observed by our missionaries that an address by one of them who could introduce historic quotations appropriately chosen, would make a hall tremble with applause, whilst a translated passage quite as good, but adapted from European authors, left the audience wholly indifferent. In the war with Russia every Japanese soldier has had before his mind some definite model, some well-known hero of history, and (mark it well) the Japanese admire in their heroes not so much military prowess as fidelity to country, loyalty, loftiness of purpose, and even generosity to the enemy. Their school-books abound in quotations of this character from the history of the nation.

In regard to the condition of religion among a people about whom so much is at present said and so little known, I could probably best describe it by tracing some outline of the life of the missionary whose aim it is to disseminate Catholic principles and doctrine upon Japanese soil. It must not be forgotten that Japan has had its Catholic history. The Japanese Catholic has written

in letters of blood a beautiful page in the annals of the religion of Jesus. Japan has shown that it is faithful to its patriotic traditions and to its Emperor; and it can therefore also demonstrate its fidelity to its God, when it knows Him. The Japanese martyrs have nothing to envy those of the Coliseum; and when the missionary reads anew the history of persecutions in Japan, whatever may be the difficulties of the present hour, he feels hope re-born in his heart for the future religious condition of this people.

The Japanese soldiers of to-day show that they are worthy sons of the ancient Samurais. Why should the Christians among them be otherwise? More than this. There have actually been found in Japan thousands of Christians who (a unique fact in the history of the world) without priests, without the administration of the Sacraments, and despite relentless persecution, have, for generations covering a period of three hundred years, kept intact the deposit of faith which had been left to them by their ancestors. These are facts which must lead one to hope for the future, even if things look dark at present, for it must be acknowledged that the present situation of the Catholic religion in Japan is not of the brightest.

It is about fifty years ago since Catholic missionaries ventured first to return to Japan for the purpose of preaching anew the gospel of Christ. It would be interesting to relate the new beginnings, the first almost miraculous retracings of long-forgotten former missionary activity, by the actual discovery of numerous Christians; but it would take me too long. Just now my purpose is more restricted. I wish to picture the situation of a Catholic missionary in Japan, to describe the life which he leads from day to day,—a life without dramatic incident, indeed, but full of interest in details that attract and inform those who are in sympathy with the missionary's noble purpose of gaining souls to Christ.

In all the great centres (it goes without saying), in all the capitals and cities of any importance, the Catholic missionary is at present to be found in the person of some priest, either European or native Japanese. Let me lead you into the residence of one of my missionaries, for their dwellings are all much alike. It is rarely in the heart of a city, because living in the busy centre

of industry is expensive, and we are poor. Still there is no missionary who, after a time, does not come to believe that his house has the best possible situation of any; for if it is not central now, it will soon be so. "See," he will tell you, "the city is growing out this way; they are going to build a railroad, and the street that passes in front of the mission will soon become one of the most important in the neighborhood."

Let us enter; but before entering I must ask you to take off your shoes, because we are in a country of mattings, and there is no greater impoliteness in the eyes of the Japanese than to walk on the mat with your shoes, however clean they may be. Missionaries have been refused entrance into hotels, because some twenty years ago a certain stranger was unfortunate enough to go into some house of the town with his shoes on.

Here we are then in the men's parlor—one or two rooms with ten or a dozen mats laid on the floor; behind the sliding doors is the ladies' parlor; nothing is simpler, as you see, than a Japanese apartment. At the end is the *toko-no-ma*, a kind of alcove raised some inches above the mats. There, in a vase, the splendor and preciousness of which indicate as a rule the degree of wealth of the proprietor, you find the flower of the season in bloom on its branch or twig,—in January, a pretty slip of the dwarfed fir-tree; in February, a tender branch of the plum-tree opening its early blossoms; in spring, a branch of the cherry-tree; in the autumn, the chrysanthemum. On the wall is a *kakemono;* above the sliding doors an inscription in Chinese, a sentiment or symbol or maxim written by some local celebrity or on request by some great man.

In this country of trifles one sees but little of that which savors of ostentation, and in this respect the Japanese are very different from Europeans and Americans, who display in their parlors whatever of curiosities they may possess. Such trinkets and rare objects as one finds here and there have their history, which the master of the house will fondly relate to you. In fact it is considered quite the proper thing to discourse in praise of some design which the *kakemono* represents; or to comment upon the artistic arrangement of the flowers which you will see at the place of honor in the *toko-no-ma*. Your old Japanese will

never fail in this matter. In accordance with polite usage, after a number of little pipes have been taken from the carved brazier, whose skilful arrangement to receive the ashes suggests a work of art, the old man will discreetly approach the flower, contemplate it on every side, and take up, with infinite precaution, the vase which contains it; he will draw it close to him, express admiration in his face, and keep on saying: "Oh!" "Ah!" "Eh!" "Eh!" There is undoubtedly something conventional in this demonstration of wonder, but one discerns also the appreciation of what is beautiful, in a way which to us foreigners is often a lesson in taste.

With the exception of a few chairs, a book-case and a work table, the room of a missionary resembles the ordinary Japanese room. Sometimes—frequently in fact—the priest will have his humble little chapel under the same roof, for the privileged localities where there are churches or separate chapels are rare. The missionary who can have separate lodging for his catechist and his boy is lucky, for usually the poverty of his resources will not allow this.

The catechist is the right-hand of the missionary. Immediately after the morning exercises, meditation, Mass, and a scanty breakfast, the catechist comes to the missionary's room to assist in his work. The previous evening had been spent by the catechist in visits to Christians, catechumens whom he instructed at their homes, and persons with whom he had become acquainted and who show a desire to know something of the Christian religion. Of these things he now comes to give his report, to account in detail for his day's work, his hopes—his vexations also—for, alas! everything is not agreeable in the life of a catechist. Hence he may become discouraged. The missionary has to rouse him to confidence, encourage him, recall to him that we are all sowers, and that to God alone it belongs to effect the growth, the increase; it is for us with trust in Providence to cultivate the good word.

The catechist is usually a middle-aged man, the father of a family, and of proved morality. It is always desirable that he should be himself well instructed. Protestant missions are as a rule amply endowed; they can afford to pay good salaries to their missionaries. But with the Catholic missionary it is different.

He finds it hard indeed to eke out a bare living. The catechist, his indispensable aid, has to resort to many an ingenious device to save himself and his family from starvation, for not only does he sacrifice the hours of his work-day to instructing others without pay, but he has to clothe himself decently. In a word, we are in the condition of the modest poor, the worst condition for apostolic workers in Japan. Generous souls who would assure Japan of a supply of catechists truly worthy of their name, would have solved more than half the problem of the evangelization of this country. "Make yourselves known to the better class, the influential people," said a wealthy Japanese one day to our missionary. This man was not a Christian, but he appreciated Catholic missions at their full value. "Where are the means?" sadly replied the missionary, thinking of his catechist—a good fellow, but hardly fitted to establish relations with cultivated society.

As the mission is without the means to support a school for catechists, the principal task of supplying religious information and also of training the teachers or catechists falls in great part upon the missionary. Nor is this a small task. The Japanese is a reader; in his newspapers and magazines he finds constantly reiterated objections against religion; the catechist will have to meet all of these. A reasoner by nature, the Japanese loves to sound his man, for, though by no means ill-disposed toward the instructor or biased as a rule, he often indulges, sometimes through a spirit of fun, always with a quiet sense of vanity, in the pleasure of embarrassing the evangelical worker. It is skirmishes and humiliations of this kind which form the burden of a catechist's complaint when he comes to relate to the Father his discomfitures. The priest is obliged to repair the damage done to the too weak armor of his catechist. This obliges him furthermore to inform himself of the state of the religious question in Japan by reading reviews and journals; not an easy matter when one considers that this literature is given in a language difficult for the European to master.

I have mentioned the religious question in Japan. In fact, there is only one religious question: more and more the cultivated spirits are tormented by "mal du divin," if I may so speak. In the current journals, in the great reviews, the young and old

doctors attack science and learning with the true mantle of Harlequin. Every article which piques itself on discussing religion is made up of fragments of the Bible, quotations from Confucius, Plato, Aristotle, Schoppenhauer, Spencer, Kant, Hegel, Tolstoi, or similar celebrities old and new. Your writer may affect to be a Christian on the first page, a pantheist on the second, a materialist in his conclusion, and all this with a charming assurance of having been logical to the very end.

It is this medley of opinions which the priest is obliged to familiarize himself with for the preparation of his conference with pagans, as also for his weekly instruction to the Christians. In the midst of a thousand inconsistencies, handling all sorts of objections, the Japanese Catholic has not only to guard and sustain his faith, but to defend it; and, in these times of superficial and desultory religious reasoning, he must be an all-sided and well-informed Christian apologist. Many have to endure a host of petty persecutions which, although not bloody, are nevertheless annoying and painful. In this country where the respective rôles of different members of the family are strictly fixed, the son will have to show his filial respect to a father who is an enemy to his faith; the wife will have to safeguard her own beliefs and the religious education of her children against the bad will of an indifferent and sometimes hostile husband.

After dinner come the visits. In a country of extreme politeness such as exists in Japan, visits play a chief part of the community life. A typhoon scourges the town. Visits. A fire has visited the house of a friend. Visits. A slight earthquake. Visits. In the spring and autumn, complimentary visits; in summer and winter, visits of sympathy; and always with the inevitable little cup of tea to drink, and the mutual complaint about the excessive heat, or the rigors of the winter. If the distance is too great, there is the mail carrier. The most insignificant clerk will send out cards by the hundred at the four seasons, and on the occasion of a thousand little incidents of daily life. "In Rome, do as the Romans do," says the proverb. The Japanese also have this proverb. The missionary is not considered exempt and feels himself bound to these thousand obligations in the midst of his arduous routine of life. There are the additional visits which are required

by his ministry. A family may have grown lax in its religious duties. The mission Father goes there. He is careful not to seem brusque or displeased, nor does he approach at once the difficult point. We are in the East, where the finger-tips are touched with satin, where everything is done with smiles, so that the "Father" has no need to indicate the motive of his visit and to emphasize it; everybody understands the object of his coming, and while pouring out the tea from a little tea-pot into a tiny cup they keep up their formal salutations, and the negligent member accuses himself without being reproached. Nor do excuses fail him or her—"pressing occupations," "the husband's cold," "the baby a little hurt," and what not else. The Father weighs the reasons graciously given, and if they are not sufficient, mildly and indirectly makes his reply felt. If anybody were to translate to a stranger what had just been said, the latter would remain under the impression that everybody was using most complimentary language, for such is the delicacy of the Japanese language. And I may add here that the lesson is not lost. Soon, perhaps the next week, one sees the fruits; the pressing occupations have ceased, the cold has disappeared, the baby is better, and—everybody comes to church.

Our visits to the Christians have all a little of the same intimate character. This does not mean, however, that they are all alike. "Ten men, ten colors," says the Japanese proverb. Thus a wealthy Samurai of the old stock, even of the new generation, will insist upon receiving you in a *select* room, will serve you with *select* tea in cups bought for a price of which he will be discreetly proud. In like manner, a poor Christian laborer, whom you may have chanced upon in his working-clothes, at the sound of your voice will go in all haste behind a thin screen to put on a more presentable dress, and he will receive you in the only room which he possesses. In each case you may be sure that the heart of your host is there. Although the Japanese have not the same manner as other people of showing their joys, their emotions, their sadness (which they express, indeed, rarely enough), they are a people of strong feelings. The Japanese is by nature an impressionist. At one time, in Europe, and without doubt also in America, the impressionists, with Ibsen at their head, were quite in the fashion. To say only ordinary things, often mere trifles,

to allow one's self to feel, to understand acute sorrows, which often involve terrible dramas, to walk fearfully as in an atmosphere of mystery, all that is the secret of impressionism. In this sense the Japanese have been impressionists for centuries, but not after the manner of actors in theatrical plays. Their poems are composed of some verses which are frequently inexplicable to us, but which open to them wide horizons of fact and feeling. Their pictures, as you know, leave one to suspect that they do not indicate the thought of their author, and yet often the Japanese who is the least educated will appreciate in them delicacies of expression hidden to the grosser sense. Here is, for instance, a man who has just lost his only child, the joy, the hope of his old age. You will have to learn this from some other token than his sorrow, which he does not express. He will announce the news to you smilingly, but you will say that there is sorrow in his salutation: "Father, my son is dead;—nothing can be done about it." There is considerable fatalism in this manner of expressing the inevitable; but for the man of faith, this is often Christian resignation with all that is beautiful and meritorious in it.

If now from the house of a Christian we pass on to that of a catechumen, the situation changes,—the tone, the manner also. There is, indeed, the same politeness, but less naturally graceful, something of the artificial manner which partakes of the Japanese character. Will Christianity take away from the Japanese people its originality? Some say it will, and they seem to have a grudge against the Japanese. It is a fact that in regard to their costumes, in the headgear of the women especially, the Protestants have introduced certain reforms, some of which are justifiable from the viewpoint of health. But the true Japanese suspects innovations of this kind. He does not recognize any longer in these young, up-to-date girls, stepping "like oxen," as he says, and staring at passers-by, the ideal which up to now was that of the Japanese woman. The Catholic priest, as you may well believe, does not enter into these details. What he wants is to put a little heart and more Christian motive and vigor into the Japanese manners without destroying them.

We are now at the door of our catechumen's house. The catechist has already seen the catechumen many times. The latter has come to the mission, has assisted at the prayers, has

heard the sermons; he has seen the missionary in his functions; but now the Father comes as a visitor. Like every good Japanese, our catechumen considers it an honor to give evidence of his unerring politeness. Ten good minutes will pass before a trained servant brings, with a thousand precautions, the elegant cinder pan designed to receive the ashes from the little pipe, or from our much less elegant cigarette (which disturbs the skilful disposition of the ashes). Ten minutes later, the mistress of the house will come, bringing in the tea. She will discreetly offer her salutations, then withdraw in silence, and you are not going to see her again until you depart. In England and in America people often speak of "home." They are proud of it, jealous up to a certain point, and few are the privileged ones allowed to know it intimately. In this matter Japan has nothing to envy these two countries, so much the more since no one is jealous of his home, of his peace, of his intimates. At the house of a catechumen, or even at the house of a pagan, in the relations of simple politeness with the Father, the first subject of conversation will, almost always, after the rain or the good weather, be Europe and America. If the missionary does not take very good care, he will have to bring his visit to an end without having touched upon the religious question. Knowing this, he diverts by a gentle transition the conversation and leads up to the subject which is nearest to his heart. At once questions will be heaped upon him, coming thick and fast, but *always* presented with the strictest politeness. If perchance you have the misfortune to be in the presence of one who had been a Protestant, or of some individual who had been constantly frequenting the company of Protestants, you may have some difficulty. Objections, more or less bitter, against Catholicity, will be often launched in a tone which is somewhat out of keeping with the habitual urbanity of the Japanese. But with the pagan in good faith there is no such danger. The Japanese detest discussions which lead to no results in conviction. Hence it is not at all advisable to suggest polemics or to put into the hands of catechumens books which are merely argumentative. The Japanese might admire the well-formed repartee, might laugh at the clever abuse showered on the back of an adversary, but on the whole the book would rouse in them aversion; for they are out of harmony with Japanese customs. In Japan, more

than anywhere else,violent discussions are left to the street porter; and anyone who may have some painful commission to fulfil, will make use of a third person to be the immediate bearer of it.

On this subject I remember a lesson given to a young confrère by an old missionary. "Do you wish," said he one evening, "to assist at what they call a Japanese *sodan?*" The *sodan* is a kind of conference where two, three, or even more persons express their views on a given case. Nothing in Japan is done without the *sodan*. "Consult," says the Japanese proverb, "if it is only your knee." "I have," continued the old missionary, "four members on my parish committee. I should like to change two of them. This must be done in the presence of the two who are to be replaced. I shall not express my opinion in any words; nevertheless at the end of the *sodan*, the two members will have learned that they are not needed. The next day they will send in their withdrawal and we shall all take leave of one another with smiling countenances." The consultation took place. It lasted for six long hours. All smoked hard on their little pipes. They barely touched upon the point in litigation; they spoke of the splendors of the last feast day, of the hopes of France, of America, of Rome, of the mystery of the Holy Trinity, of the miracles at Lourdes, the fine weather, the rain, the rice harvest, etc. "Well?" said my young confrère when everybody had gone. "The thing is fixed," said the old Father. "But there was hardly anything said about it, though I knew you did not wish to express an opinion yourself," answered the young priest. "You will see." The two members were in fact on hand the next day to present their resignations with most serious apologies.

One may understand from this how circumspect it is necessary to be in religious discussions with people who are accustomed to take the slightest hints. These discussions are sometimes a little long, and the missionary may be obliged to cut them short; but he will find some readily accepted reason,—he has his Office to say, or there is just time enough before dinner to do a certain work, or whatever else may present itself as a valid excuse to his mind; and so he is gracefully accorded the privilege of breaking up the meeting.

† JULES CHATRON.

*Bishop of Osaka, Japan.*

(To be continued.)

## THE TRAINING OF A WEALTHY PARISHIONER.

### III.—Three Ladies Drink Tea and Discuss the Pros and Cons.

"WELL, you were right, after all, Mary," said Mrs. Melgrove, when she had returned from the door. "Father Sinclair does not do things by halves. To my mind this library scheme has many attractions. The site is an ideal one. I know the room; it opens onto the street in a long wide entry. There would be no great difficulty to secure librarians; we can easily get them. But I confess I am not yet satisfied with his answer to my third objection,—that of securing the books."

"Nor I," rejoined Miss Rayford. "Father Sinclair's suggestion is hardly practical. Soliciting cast-off books from Catholic families is not satisfactory to me. We might get a few books—a few Scotts, or Dickens, or Newmans—these we should have to keep in stock any way, and they would be useful. But a circulating library must be up to date. The latest books must be had as soon as they are issued; and we cannot surely depend on the casual gifts, as he suggests, for our literature."

Meanwhile the hostess had been looking after the samovar, and Miss Garvey was getting the cups and saucers ready.

"Father Sinclair's plan," ventured Mrs. Melgrove, while pouring out the delicious tea, "is rather to have families donate a certain number. If each were to contribute say ten volumes, the shelves would be quickly filled."

"But don't you see, Madam," urged Miss Rayford, "that if we had no choice in the selection, we should be getting the same authors over and over again. Our people are not a reading class. The few who indulge in that pastime have their wants supplied by the Elzevir and the Humboldt. You will find very few of the modern writers in private libraries. Old ones satisfy our people in this respect. Asking Catholic families to donate a dozen volumes each might succeed in filling the new library shelves, if things were seen as Father Sinclair sees them. But think of the task before us! Besides, for other reasons, I have misgivings as to the result of this undertaking. When you go to ask our wealthy Catholics in this city for a donation to some good work,

you are always met with the old song: 'We have so many other things to keep up——'"

"Yes," broke in Miss Garvey, almost savagely, "and they spend more in one week in useless amusements than they spend in a year in charities. I know it, for I live among them."

"Is not that a little exaggerated?" asked the hostess, timidly, as she brought the tea-tray to the table.

"Exaggerated! At Tannhäuser, last week, the Fells family, and the Newells, and the Molveys, occupied boxes that must have cost them at least thirty dollars apiece. And that opera cloak worn by Mrs. Helerand is valued at something like a thousand dollars, I hear."

"Well, Mary, here is a chance for you to do something. Shall we call it 'slum-work'?" suggested the hostess.

"That is the word; and I certainly shall go into it. I know Mrs. Helerand personally, and I am assuredly going to call on her. It is about time that these people were brought to their senses. They are doing almost nothing for the Church or her works; and when they do ever so little, we are sure to learn all about it in the *Times* next day. Isn't it wearying?"

This short speech was uttered by the little lady with an accent which brought conviction to her hearers; but which did not prevent her meanwhile from emptying her teacup.

The hostess looked at her.

"Miss Garvey, please don't put on that fierce look when you visit the Helerands. You will surely spoil your chances."

"Leave them to me," replied the little lady.

And they both gathered up the cups and saucers and put them on the table in the corner.

Meanwhile Miss Rayford, who had been reflecting for some time, spoke up.

"Here is a scheme that I suggest. Could we not invite a number of our prominent ladies—fifteen or twenty—to meet this day week and get up some sort of entertainment, which would bring in a few dollars for books and other things? You know we must have shelves and glass doors made. There is none in the Young Men's Clubroom."

"Why could not Appleby, the undertaker, give these things

for his share? He belongs to the parish, doesn't he?" asked Miss Garvey, energetically.

"Will you see him about it?" enquired the hostess.

"Certainly I shall, and he shall have to give them. He has made considerably more than the value of a few book-shelves out of us in coffins and trappings in the past twenty years." Miss Garvey was evidently taking Father Sinclair's library scheme to heart, for she added:

"I think Miss Rayford's suggestion a good one. While you were in Europe, Mrs. Melgrove, the Women's Art Club held a 'Renaissance Tea,' and in three evenings they paid off the debt of their clubrooms."

"Indeed!" interrupted the hostess. "That explains a dainty invitation to their preliminary meeting I found waiting me when I returned."

"These ladies do everything daintily," continued Miss Garvey. "Their Tea was a perfect success. They organized canvassing committees thoroughly before they set to work. They then called on the different families for the loan of their art treasures. One committee solicited paintings and etchings; another, plate; another, ivory and bronze curios; another, old tapestry; another, rare books and manuscripts. Monument Hall was partitioned off into sections, each receiving a suggestive name. You had the Raffaele section; the Sèvres section; the Gobelin section, and so on. Tea was served free to all. A small admission was taken at the various sections; and it would surprise you to see how quickly the dollars rolled into the treasury. In three short evenings the ladies of the Art Club took in nearly a thousand dollars. The treasures, which had been strictly checked, were then sent back to their owners, with a note of thanks, and everybody was happy."

"A novel idea, certainly," said the hostess; "but it would be impossible to get up a benefit for our library scheme on the same lines."

"Undoubtedly; I merely suggest something similar."

"Why not consider the scheme of nations and national costumes?" asked Mrs. Melgrove. "One of the prettiest sights I saw during my summer abroad was at Buda-Pesth. The Hun-

garian peasants and nobles held some sort of celebration, and dressed in their different costumes for a thousand years back. The sight was very picturesque and drew crowds of people."

"That is a charming idea," said Miss Rayford; "but such schemes require a lot of preliminary study. And besides, look at the expense!"

"I should not think of doing things so elaborately as the Hungarians did," Mrs. Melgrove hastened to say. "But would it not be possible to dress our young ladies in costumes of a dozen different nations for the entertainment? While people sipped their tea, they could be kept busy guessing what countries were represented. This would at least have the merit of novelty in Laurenboro, and it might prove interesting to many. However, it would be better perhaps first of all to carry out your suggestion, Miss Rayford, and invite a few ladies to talk the matter over."

"Where could we meet?" asked Miss Garvey.

"Why not here?" answered the hostess. "We can easily open the folding-doors of the large parlor downstairs; and I think I can furnish chairs for fifteen or twenty."

It was agreed to meet at the Melgroves' the following Wednesday, and to notify Father Sinclair. The hostess saw her two friends to the door, and bade them good night; for it had grown dusk.

A few flakes of snow, harbingers of the coming winter, were falling, and a cold night-wind made the ladies quicken their steps down the avenue.

"I did not know that Silas Maglundy belonged to our church, Miss Garvey," said her companion, when they were standing to let a street car pass.

"Neither did I till I was told so. I never see him at church. He is, I suppose, like many others, a merely nominal Catholic."

"Well, if he belongs to the parish, he must be made to help us before he gets further away. Father Sinclair will have to get after him."

"Father Sinclair to my mind is altogether too shy," said Miss Garvey. "If he could execute as well as he can plan, he would do marvellous work in Laurenboro."

"But he has us to execute his plans, Miss Garvey. Here comes the car."

"And we'll just do it, then. That library scheme grows on me the more I think of it. I can see all the good it will effect; and I am going to do all I can for it. This is my blue car. So good night."

And the ladies sped off in different directions.

## IV.—The Pastor Takes the Public into his Confidence.

The last leaf had dropped from the maples on Ashburne Avenue, leaving nothing but the tiny branches and the parting season's birds' nests. A heavy fall of snow had meanwhile thrown a mantle of whiteness over the whole city of Laurenboro. The nine o'clock Mass the following Sunday morning was crowded as usual. The large attendance was chiefly due to the fact that the function was over in forty minutes. Or, as Mrs. Magillicuddy explained it, "because people wanted to show how stingy they could be with Almighty God."

After the Gospel, Father Sinclair made the announcements for the week. One of them read:—

A meeting of ladies is called for three o'clock, on Wednesday, at Mrs. Horace Melgrove's, Ashburne Avenue, to consider the formation of a Catholic public library.

"You may not be aware, brethren," continued the pastor, commenting on the announcement, "of the need of a Catholic library in this city. We have several public libraries, it is true, but there is not one of them that does not contain works insulting to our holy religion, calumniating her clergy, falsifying her traditions and her history. Are our children and young people to be allowed to read such books because they are free? We must do nothing to minimize respect for authority or religious influences among us. With us, religion is dearer than life. With us, the soul is more precious than the body. Now, see the precautions that are taken to keep contagion out of our homes. The sick are set apart and quarantined; no one is allowed to go near them, lest any become infected. And what are all these precautions taken for? To preserve these poor bodies of ours; to keep them in life a few years longer.

"What disease is to the body, error and immoral principles

are to the soul. Are we going to allow our children, and those who are near and dear to us, to read books that instil the poison of irreligion and immorality into their souls? Public libraries that make no effort to control the works of their shelves are disseminators of immoral contagion, and are a menace to a community. We are bound in conscience to prevent their books getting an entry into our homes. We lock our doors against thieves who would rob us of our treasures, and shall we allow works to come into our homes that would rob us of our souls?

"Seeing that our people must read, I have resolved to establish a library of our own in this parish, where sound mental food will be free to all; whither parents may let their children go safely; where there will be no danger of moral contamination; where we may enjoy intellectual pleasure without running the risk of undermining our faith. As you are going to be the gainers by this work, I appeal to your generosity. I have the approbation of the Archbishop; and His Grace asks me to say in his name that he will be gratified to learn that the library is a success."

The people moved slowly out of the church, after Mass, and went off in different directions to their homes.

"What's that new scheme the Father was talking to us this mornin' about?" asked Mrs. O'Connell, during her breakfast.

"He's gettin' up a libr'ry," answered the husband; "and faith they want somethin' badly to take up their evenin's, in place of galavantin' 'round the streets. Just look, Hannah, at that dirty sheet"—the Sunday *Tribune* was lying on the table—"who fetched that into this house?"

"Kitty brought it in," said the mother.

"Well, there it goes into the fire"—suiting his action to his words—"and tell Kitty, if she wants somethin' to read——"

Kitty heard her name and walked in.

"Did you bring that paper into this house, Kitty?"

"Yes, daddy; I got it at the corner after Mass, for the pictures and the stories."

"Now, Kitty, let me never see that vile paper here again."

"But, daddy, what are we going to do? You don't want to let me go to the park with the other girls; and you don't want

to let me go to the Elzevir. And you don't know how long the Sunday is, with nothing to read and nowhere to go."

"My girl, you'll have somethin' to read after this. Father Sinclair is goin' to start a libr'ry; and I want you to jine it. D'ye hear?"

"Yes, daddy, I hear. Of course I'll join it. I am dying to read nice books, and so are the other girls."

O'Connell was an industrious workingman, with a few hundred to his credit in the District Savings Bank. In his young days he had striven unsuccessfully for a teacher's diploma, and he still read a great deal in his spare moments. Although his grammar and his accent were not without blemish, he had wisdom enough to know the influence of bad books and newspapers on the impressionable years of youth.

"Kitty, dear, here's a letter," said her father, after dinner; "take it down to Father Sinclair. You'll find him in the sacristy after Vespers."

The pastor was taking off his stole and surplice that afternoon when a timid little girl walked up and handed him a letter.

"Sick-call, Kitty?"

"No, Father; only a letter from daddy."

Father Sinclair opened it and read :—

Dear Father,—I heard your sermon on bad readin' this mornin' and I am heart and soul with your reverence. Use the enclosed twenty-five dollars for the new libry; and may God prosper your undertaking. It is badly needed in our town.

TERENCE O'CONNELL.

P. S.—I have some books that have been in a trunk for twenty years past. If you want them for the new libry, you are welcome to them.

"Tell your father, Kitty, that I thank him for his gift; and also tell him that I shall be glad to get the books."

O'Connell's gift of money and his offer of books were in Father Sinclair's mind an echo of the popular sentiment; and with the enthusiasm of one who feels that he is on the verge of success in some great enterprise, he mentioned his library project to half-a-dozen parishioners that day and asked them to send to the glebe house any volumes they might no longer need.

In the half darkness that night, on his way down to supper, he stumbled over a heap in the hallway.

"What are all these bundles, Nanny?" he asked the housekeeper, a relic of the days of the ship-fever, who had faithfully served three of his predecessors in St. Paul's, and who had reached an age when shrewdness is at a premium and years are no longer counted.

"I dunno, your Reverence," said Nanny; "they do be ringin' the bell all the afthernoon, and lavin' one parcel afther another. They all say they do be books for your schame, your Reverence."

But the opening up of the bundles disillusionized Father Sinclair, and proved that, notwithstanding his other accomplishments, he had not yet learned how to stock a public library. There were dozens and dozens of volumes in every stage of decomposition; some with pages, even whole chapters, missing; others, without their covers; nine-tenths of the novels were of the lurid order.

"They will do for kindling the fire," mused the pastor. And he frankly admitted there and then that he had not solved Mrs. Melgrove's third objection: "Where are the books to come from?"

"Who left the bundles, Nanny?" he asked.

"O, I dunno, your Reverence. Mrs. Breen's two little girls fetched a parcel, and the Widow Gallagher came herself, and Katy O'Connell, and Molly Miller, and Susie Bernardi, and—I dunno—a dozen came."

There were just a dozen bundles.

"Sure I didn't keep no count of who came and who didn't, your Reverence. The Widow Gallagher says why don't you go afther the rich men for your schame. There's Mr. Maglundy, says she, sure isn't he goin' to put a drinkin' fountain for horses forninst her house in Blannen Square. And what do they be wantin' with a fountain there for, I'd like to know?"

"Take them to the kitchen, Nanny, and store them away. I'll tell you later what they are for."

This was a precautionary measure. It would never do to let it get out among the donors that the gifts of books were of no earthly use except to light fires with. One remark of Nanny's friend, the Widow Gallagher, made Father Sinclair reflect—the fountain in Blenheim Square and its donor.

"Maglundy is turning up pretty often lately," thought the pastor, as he went up to his study to consult the Directory. "Who is he and where is he from?"

The music of that euphonious name had never sounded in his ears until Miss Garvey uttered it at the Melgroves'. The Directory had no such word in its thousand pages, which proved that the owner thereof was a new arrival in Laurenboro. Father Sinclair had read in some review or other an article on "Men revealed in their Names," and he set earnestly to work to paint a mind-picture of the man who bore the name Maglundy. He was elderly; he was a millionaire; he was a Catholic—all this Miss Garvey had said. But was he tall or short? stout or thin? was he gruff or affable? generous or miserly? vain or retiring? Here was food for a half-hour's speculation in the philosophic mind of Father Sinclair.

But the picture was not even sketched. The name Maglundy told him nothing. The fact that the owner was about to give a drinking-fountain to the denizens of Blenheim Square offered no clue to his character. So many selfish motives—vanity not excluded—may becloud public benefactions that the pastor refused to commit himself to a verdict on the character of one reputed to be a Catholic millionaire.

"However," he mused, as he put the Directory aside and took up his Breviary for Matins and Lauds, "if Silas Maglundy is a Catholic, we shall soon know more about him."

## V.—Lay Forces are Called into Action.

Mrs. Melgrove's large drawing-room was ablaze with light the following Wednesday afternoon. The folding-doors had been thrown open, revealing a perfect treasure-house of art. Such taste and such delicacy of selection! In her travels through Europe the hostess had picked up many an artistic gem in the shape of a miniature, or a cameo, or a bronze object of one pattern or another. An exquisite reproduction of the Salpion rested on the floor. A Sistine Madonna, holding her sorrowfully sweet Child, hung from one of the walls where the light-effects were favorable. On another, various pictures of child-life, mostly the work of German artists, and etchings signed by the authors them-

selves. A Leo XIII by Chartran stood on an easel near the folding-doors. The same taste displayed itself in the selection of her books—all Catholic and standard. The Catholic tone was felt the moment the Melgrove threshold was crossed.

The ladies began to straggle in by twos and threes. Miss Garvey had reached the house a few minutes ahead; she was helping the hostess to unwrap their furs and to make them feel at home. Already over twenty-five had come when three o'clock rang, and Father Sinclair entered, recognizing well-known faces seated here and there in the large room.

The pastor of St. Paul's was one of those priests who had cultivated the possibilities of lay coöperation in his parish. Himself naturally diffident and retiring, he had by means of the zealous helpers whom he saw before him at the Melgroves, done much in his small district that would otherwise have been left undone. Among these ladies were his League Promoters' Visiting Committee, who went to see the poor twice a week during the cold season; his Hospital Committee, whereby Wednesdays and Saturdays were given over to the sick in the city hospitals; his Vigilance Committee, to keep an eye on University students, many of whom were strangers in Laurenboro and disposed to run wild after lecture hours; his First Communion Committee among the poorer children in Gottingen Ward. The new library scheme, he felt confident, would eventually succeed.

A chair had been provided for him, and a small table; and when he sat down, it was in presence of a band of workers who, if they so desired, could make his new library scheme, or any other scheme, a perfect success—and he knew it.

"Ladies," he began, "I had occasion at the Masses last Sunday to make you acquainted with a plan suggested to meet a very pressing need. You are aware of the efforts that are now being made by our friends on Fessenden Avenue to foist a lot of denominational literature on us. Besides, I had the privilege of looking over the Elzevir catalogue a few days ago, and was astounded at the number of books there that are on the Index—books that Catholics are forbidden to read—Balzac, George Sand, the two Dumas ——"

A rustling of silk was heard in a corner of the room.

"Pardon me, Father. Is Dumas on the Index?" asked a Catholic lady graduate of a fashionable seminary.

"Yes, madam, all the works of both father and son."

"Well, really—," the young lady was going to tell that she had read them all, but she simply said, "I did not know they were."

"It is a serious matter," continued the pastor, "for a Catholic to read works that are thus proscribed. One's conscience becomes involved. I shall have occasion later, I trust, to explain the seemingly severe rules that govern the decisions of the Roman Congregation of the Index; meanwhile you will understand, ladies, why I am so anxious that something should be done this winter."

This speech, short as it was, had a surprising effect on some of the ladies present, and told them a few things they evidently did not know.

"Now, if we desire to succeed in doing anything," he went on, "we must organize. We shall need officers and committees. If some one will propose a name for president——."

Quick as a flash, Miss Garvey stood up and proposed the name of Mrs. Horace Melgrove.

"I second the motion, and take great pleasure in doing so," said Miss Rayford. "Mrs. Melgrove has taken deep interest in our works of charity for years, and has had experience in library matters. This library is also a work that I know appeals to her; and for this reason I second Miss Garvey's motion."

"It has been moved and seconded," added Father Sinclair, "that Mrs. Horace Melgrove be made president of our library organization. Is there any other candidate?"

There was no other candidate; only absolute silence.

"Seeing that there is no opposition, I declare Mrs. Melgrove elected by acclamation——"

But the pastor got no further. A general clapping of hands bespoke the popularity of the new president.

"Mrs. Melgrove will take the chair presently," continued Father Sinclair. "She will explain the object of our meeting more fully than I have done. She will help you to select your other officers and name the heads of the committees. I feel that

the library interests are advancing rapidly, and I know that whatever you decide to do this afternoon will be for the best."

A murmur of satisfaction swept through the room.

"Now, ladies, if you will excuse me, I shall leave you to your deliberations"—the priest stood up—"if there is anything that I can do to help you out, you have only to drop a note, or call at the glebe-house."

And while the affable pastor was being conducted to the door by the hostess, a buzz of conversation began to grow in the room. It was a score of ladies talking all at once, and about everything but the library.

A moment later Mrs. Melgrove took her place in the president's chair.

"Before we proceed to the election of the other officers," she began, in a business-like way, "I desire to thank you, ladies, for the mark of confidence you have placed in me. I shall do all in my power to retain it. I feel that the work we are about to engage in, and which Father Sinclair has evidently much at heart, is one worthy of our very best efforts. As our pastor has already told you, there is sad need of a wholesome public library in our city. Children in our parish are all readers nowadays, and I feel it is our duty to provide them with sound reading-matter. Father Sinclair furnishes the hall. The librarians are easy to get. The books are the next thing to think about.

"Three of us, Miss Garvey, Miss Rayford, and myself, have had several informal talks over the affair, and we have thought that some money-making scheme, in the course of a week or so, should bring in a few hundred dollars, which could be invested in books. However, before we proceed further, we shall need a secretary, and two or three counsellors."

The work of election was performed in true parliamentary fashion, the secretaryship naturally falling to Miss Garvey, she being known as a most energetic and intelligent worker in such matters.

It was now in order to discuss ways and means. Several ladies timidly suggested a house-to-house collection of books—Father Sinclair's idea—but they were left without a prop by the inexorable logic of Miss Rayford. The majority seemed to think

that an entertainment and fancy sale would be the proper thing to have.

"Then, ladies, let us have the entertainment," said the president. "What name shall we give it?"

"I would suggest Autumn Festival," said one lady.

"Or Afternoon Tea," asserted another.

"Or Five O'Clock Social," ventured a third.

"Three excellent suggestions," rejoined the president. "Let us begin with the first. All in favor of Autumn Festival as a name for our entertainment and fancy sale, will please raise their hands."

A fierce gust of wind had sprung up at that moment, and the branches tapping against the window panes of the large rooms evidently weighed in favor of that name. A cloud of hands, begloved but dainty, went into the air, and decided that an Autumn Festival was the function that should be given in the interests of the new library.

As those present were quite familiar with the details of fancy sales, and as the evening was advancing, the rest of the business was quickly disposed of. One lady offered to look after the candies; another would take charge of the flower-tables; another o the ice-cream; another of the tea and coffee. Each would choose her own assistants. Monument Hall would be secured for that day fortnight. The Committee on Printing would get the tickets into circulation as soon as possible.

"I cannot impress on you, ladies," said the president, while the furs were being donned, "how important it is to dispose of as many tickets as possible. Our success will depend on that. Get your friends interested; talk about the Festival, and we shall be able to give Father Sinclair a good round sum for the library."

It was nearly six o'clock when the meeting broke up. The Autumn Festival was started. The enthusiasm that reigned among the ladies predicted success.

The following evening, an anonymous article appeared in the local *Times* on "Reading." The day after, one on the "Importance of Books on the Formation of Character." The day after that again, one on "Controlling the Reading of the Young." Every evening, the library question was being discussed, even on

the streets, till it threatened for the moment to exclude even the coming civic elections.

"How is the Autumn Festival getting on, Eleanor?" asked Melgrove of his wife a few evenings later, when he reached his home. "They are doing nothing down-town these days but talking library. Here is a fourth article on the 'Need of Wholesome Public Libraries.' I'll wager it is Father Sinclair preparing public opinion for his scheme. He is certainly doing his share, and doing it well. There is no one on the *Times*, except Burton, who can write like that. Listen, Nell. It reads like Newman."

And Melgrove began to read out Father Sinclair's clear-cut pure English sentences, logical and forceful.

"Why, Nell, that prose would bring conviction to the most granite-skulled native of Laurenboro. Are the tickets printed yet?" asked Melgrove.

"Printed and out," quietly answered his wife.

"How many do you want me to take?"

"At least a dozen, dear."

"Ahem, sorry I asked. But that Father Sinclair is a pusher. Here is all Laurenboro reading his prose to-night, persuaded that something will happen if St. Paul's doesn't get a new library. The Elzevir people must feel pleased just now."

The dinner-bell—the tocsin of the hungry soul—rang at that moment, and Melgrove's reflections suddenly took another direction. What logic will resist the sound of a dinner bell?

E. J. DEVINE, S.J.

*Montreal, Canada.*

---

## THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW LAW.

### II.

IN the previous paper, which appeared in the July number of the REVIEW, there were set forth some new views of sacrifice differing from those that have been generally current hitherto; and an endeavor was made to ascertain the fundamental essence of sacrifice in its external material and action, the idea it expresses, and its purpose. The great bulk of theologians have considered

sacrifice to be essentially a destruction of life in honor of God, for the purpose of expressing latreutic worship, or repentance for sin and atonement. This may be termed for present convenience the Destruction-theory. It is now alleged on serious grounds that sacrifice is of the nature of a meal, and that its object is to assert a bond of union between the partakers and the Deity. We may call this the Banquet-theory. The new view is of great interest from the historical and archæological point of view; to the theologian it is of still higher importance for its bearing on some of the chief articles of Christian doctrine and ritual.

Nothing stands out more prominently or is better defined in outline than the double mystery of the Sacrifice on Calvary and on the Altar. They are great historical facts, the basis of all Christian faith and external worship; and through them God's name is glorified in every nation and in every age, from the rising to the setting of the sun. The facts are these: that the Son of God made man died on the Cross to expiate the sins of the world, that He gave us His true Body and Blood in the Last Supper, and that He continues to do so daily in the Mass. All the certainties of faith on these points and all its obscurities centre round three propositions: The Sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same thing with that of the Cross; the Mass is a true and proper sacrifice: it is according to the order of Melchisedec and not of Aaron. So speaks the infallible voice of God in Scripture and the Church. The Council of Trent in its Catechism says: "Unum itaque et idem sacrificium esse fatemur, et haberi debet, quod in Missa peragitur et quod Cruce oblatum est." And "eos damnavit qui asserunt verum et proprium Sacrificium Deo non offerri."[1] The Creed of Pius V says: "Profiteor pariter in Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium, et propitiatorium Sacrificium." The Old and the New Testament tell us that the Messias is a "priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec."

But faith and theory are very different things. We know that such a thing is so, but we cannot see how and why it is. In the former case we have positive and uniform belief; in the latter, mere opinions divergent and numerous. There are countless distinctions and refinements of explanation about the nature and meaning of

[1] Sc. in the Mass.

the sacrificial act, about the precise significance of the Crucifixion and the Last Supper, and about the relation of these to one another and the Mass. Not one of these views has received the seal of the Church's authentication, not one but has been set aside as inconclusive or false by a large number of theologians, not one has any claim on our acceptance; we are at liberty to reject any one or all together.

Until lately the data did not exist for an accurate appreciation of the rite of sacrifice. It was looked at in a partial and superficial way, and that which first struck the eye was assumed to be its most important element. Theologians, to quote a late writer in an ecclesiastical review, "took it for granted, as generally admitted, that all sacrificial action consists essentially in some kind of destruction of the thing sacrificed." Indeed the idea of death or destruction had become well nigh inseparable from the name of sacrifice. Custom and language had made it so; the authority of religious writers was all on the same side. The associations of sacrifice with the numerous oblations of Gentile and Jewish temples, and more especially with that event by which the Lord Jesus consummated our Redemption, have so consecrated that notion of sacrifice as to make it extremely difficult to change it for another. To question the correctness of the definition is almost like laying an irreverent hand on the doctrines themselves. It may be well to recall the words of Cardinal Franzelin in his treatise *De Sacrificio*. In Thesis XIV he says: "Credendum pariter est, elementa omnia, quae essentiam constituunt sacrificii generatim spectati, in hoc speciali sacrificio reperiri; non tamen ideo aeque ad fidem explicatam pertinet, vel quae sint omnes et solae essentiales notae sacrificii in genere, vel in quo hujus eucharisticae sacrificationis essentia unice reponenda sit." And in Thesis XVI: "Non tamen ex ea (sc. mystica sanguinis effusione) per se spectata satis intelligitur *quomodo* Eucharistiae celebratio in se ipsa sit verum et proprium sacrificium." It is now suggested that the definition of sacrifice hitherto accepted is an erroneous one, and that it is due to this misconception that theories about the Mass have been generally so unconvincing.

The destruction-theory does not very exactly accord with the terms of doctrine as laid down by Council and Creed; it rather

leads logically to conclusions that conflict with them; conclusions which can be avoided only by careful distinctions and qualifications, and by the power born of infused faith to recognize truth in spite of difficulties. The banquet-theory on the other hand makes the Cross and the Mass not simply reconcilable with one another, but shows them to be organically conjoined as different parts of one and the same sacrificial operation; it makes the Mass to be in itself a true and proper sacrifice without any minimizing of the plain declarations of the Church; and according to it the Mass is a true Melchisedec-sacrifice without being assimilated to the sacrifices of Aaron's order. Let us test the two theories by applying them successively to the Christian Sacrifice as it was on Mount Calvary, and in the Upper Chamber and on our altars.

According to the destruction-theory the sacred drama that took place on Calvary was constituted a full and perfect sacrifice by the death of Jesus Christ in atonement for our sins; for all the elements of sacrifice according to the hypothesis are found in it. If that be really so, nothing additional to it in the way of sacrifice is possible. Our Lord's endurance of death is of infinite efficacy, so it does not need to be duplicated; it cannot be prolonged, because it came to an end with the Resurrection; it is no longer in any way actual except in the permanence of its effect; consequently it cannot be made eternal in itself, but only as a memory or in some dramatic representation. If a ceremony had to be instituted as a solemn external act of worship and a memorial of the Sacrifice of Calvary, it might indeed be made into the likeness of our Lord's death, and yet not be on that account the same identical sacrifice. Even the same Divine Presence on each occasion would not make them one and the same event. Further, the same sacrificial substance might be presented to God in the ceremony as on the Cross, but the new action would still be a different one from that which was once completed and closed. Neither would the ceremony be constituted one with the Crucifixion by its having the same efficiency and bestowing the same graces; it would not on that account be necessarily more than an application and a channel for the effects of our Lord's death, like the Sacraments. The Mass might have all these characteristics (as indeed it has) without being made by them to be one thing with

the Sacrifice of the Cross; the fact would still remain that there were two different actions carried out in different ways. If the slaying of Christ was essentially the sacrifice, then the sacrificial action was ended and incommunicable, and no other action, however similar, can be continuous with it or identical. The principle of the identity of the Mass with the Crucifixion must be sought elsewhere.

The logical results of the destruction-theory could not be better exhibited than by a certain well-informed and most orthodox writer, the Rev. Fr. Hughes, in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, already alluded to. Although he has before him the Catechism of the Council of Trent and is expounding its doctrine of the Mass, he cannot get nearer to it, while starting from the destruction-theory as a postulate, than as follows: "The identity of the Sacrifice of the Mass with that of the Cross which is asserted by the Catechism (sc. of the Council of Trent) is an identity *secundum quid*, and not an identity *simpliciter*. It is an identity in certain aspects—in respect truly of the most important characteristics of both; an identity namely of priest and victim. This identity *secundum quid* is quite enough to justify Catholics in saying that the celebration of the Holy Mass is in a very real sense the same as the Sacrifice offered on Calvary, but the words of the Catechism would hardly appear to imply absolute and unqualified identity between the two. . . . The Sacrifice of the Cross, too, must be looked upon, not as forming one *simpliciter* with the continual Sacrifice of the New Law, but rather as its origin and fountain-head. . . . The Sacrifice of the Mass, while *secundum quid* identical with the oblation made on Calvary, is *simpliciter diversum*." This passage might conceivably have been written as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the destruction-theory. It simultaneously asserts and denies the doctrine of the Council. Lehmkuhl, however, says exactly the same: "Suarez aliique theologi communius asserunt, idque recte, potius dici *simpliciter* diversa sacrificia (cruentum videlicet et incruentum) quam unum idemque, at unum idemque dici debere *secundum quid*."[2] So likewise do many other theologians; but instead of putting it plainly and directly, as do the foregoing passages, they veil it in a cloud of seemly ambiguities.

[2] *Theol. Mor.*, Vol. II, p. 122, ed. 1888.

The second point in which the destruction-theory falls short of doctrinal requirements is in that of the Mass being a true and proper sacrifice. The theory requires that there should be a destruction sufficiently real to constitute a real sacrifice; the fact is, speaking plainly, that there is no such thing in the Mass. If a slaying is to be taken as the essential note of a sacrifice, then the Mass is no sacrifice. To justify the application of the word sacrifice in that sense to the Mass, it would become necessary to prove that there is a real sacrifice in a rite from which the essential constituent of sacrifice is absent. To this futile attempt most theologians address themselves. All the expedients of logic which they resort to in order to reconcile the two irreconcilables amount to one of two things: either that the Mass is not absolutely a true sacrifice, or that the constituent act of destruction need not be a real one.

One way of escaping from the direct consequences of the destruction-theory is to say that a quasi-destruction will serve the purpose as well as a real destruction. Apart, however, from the fact that a quasi-destruction is no more to be found in the Mass than a real one, there is the fatal difficulty, insisted on by Cardinal Bellarmine, that a quasi-destruction will give us only a quasi-sacrifice, instead of the real one that the Church asserts. The same objection lies against all the other more or less indefinite terms that are used in the same connection. One of the chief is the word "mystical"; it has two senses, one appropriate and one not so; and it is this latter that it generally bears when said of the Mass. The Mass is indeed a "mystical" sacrifice in the sense that it contains mysteries, something sacred and hidden, something not fully comprehensible, over and above what is visible to sense; but there is a different meaning, which is thus given in the *Manual of Catholic Theology:* "We use the term 'mystical' in reference to the mystery in which the effusion takes place; it is opposed to 'real', and equivalent to 'representative, commemorative, or relative.'"[3] If "it is opposed to 'real'" it is equally opposed to "true and proper" of the Creed and the Council. The word "representative" does not improve matters; a representation of a sacrifice can hardly be called a sacrifice sub-

[3] Vol. II, page 456.

stantively. The same with "relative." The Mass of course has some relation to the Crucifixion; but the phrase is too indefinite to be a proof or even an assertion that the Mass is a real sacrifice; still less does it show *how* the Mass is such. Words like these explain nothing; they only serve to veil the self-contradictions contained in the explanations.

Another method of escape from unconformable conclusions amounts to practically giving up "destruction." Vasquez proposed "immutatio per destructionem;" some now would retain only the "immutatio." The elusive sacrificial act of the Mass was by many localized in the Consecration; but this obviously is the very reverse of destruction, it is a production.[4] Hence the word "immutatio" was chosen; but it is no definition, for it is of so broad a meaning that it does not differentiate sacrifice from any other action or motion in the universe.

The destruction-theory further does not harmonize with the doctrine that the Messias is a priest according to the order of Melchisedec; it makes His Melchisedec-sacrifice to be a second one, different and superfluous. Making the sacrificial act to consist in death, it makes the Crucifixion to be in itself and by itself a complete sacrifice, and Jesus Christ, therefore, to be a priest of the Levitical order, offering a victim by blood-shedding; and if this be so, then our Lord exercises a second priesthood, and offers a different sacrifice in the Melchisedec-rite of the Mass, albeit that He, the same Divine Principal, officiates in both. If the substantive sacrifice be the Aaronic one, why should it not be commemorated or represented as an Aaronic sacrifice instead of being translated into a different ritual? We may make an adaptation of the passage in the Epistle: "If then perfection were by the Levitical priesthood . . . what further need was there that another priest should rise according to the order of Melchisedec, and not be called according to the order of Aaron?"[5] The complete Aaronic priesthood of our Lord would have excluded the Melchisedec-priesthood; and in like manner the complete Melchisedec-priesthood, which alone is attributed to our Lord, must exclude the Aaronic priesthood, and so forbid the idea that the blood-shedding on Calvary was properly a sacrificial act.

[4] *Manual of Catholic Theology*, Vol. II, page 200. [5] Heb. 7: 2.

Under the influence of the destruction-theory theologians have persistently endeavored to trace a correspondence between the two rites in that precise particular which constitutes their difference. They cannot conceive the Melchisedec ceremony to be a real sacrifice unless it contains some equivalent of the slaying, which is a mere accident of the Levitical rite. Their idea is that "that real death on Calvary must be so repeated in every Mass as to constitute it then and there a real sacrifice." Urged by this imaginary necessity they seek for suggestions of death in every action of the Mass. The only loss of existence is in the bread and wine which are changed into the Sacred Body and Blood; but this of course is insufficient. The receiving of the Sacred Species, which obviously means union with our Lord under the semblance of nutrition, is interpreted by some as a destruction, on the ground that in it our Lord loses His sacramental existence. Then there is the *immutatio* that our Lord undergoes, which is supposed to be in some way equipollent with destruction, which in its turn passes into sacrifice. Equivalent death is also seen by some in the mode of existence which our Lord submits to under the form of inanimate substance; and also in the separation of the two species which, *vi verborum*, figures a separation of the Sacred Body and Blood; a separation which, as we shall see, has a totally different meaning. On this point Drs. Wilhelm and Scannell remark: "The painful efforts of theologians to inflict at least a semblance of death on the Author of life are entirely due to their narrow notions of sacrifice."[6]

The specialty of the Melchisedec-rite is that all death, destruction, blood-shedding are rigidly excluded from it. No such thing is recorded of the sacrifice of the priest of the Most High God, the King of Salem; it was no more than a solemn banquet of bread and wine eaten before the Lord. If the fact of a destruction or quasi-destruction could be established in the Mass, this would make it no longer a Melchisedec-sacrifice, but a repetition or at least an imitation of an Aaronic sacrifice, and in either case a different sacrificial action from that of Mount Calvary. The failure of theologians to agree upon any definite act of destruction in the Mass proves sufficiently that it is futile to seek such a thing there. It is not there because it does not need to be there.

[6] *Manual of Catholic Theology*, Vol. II, page 458.

Let us now take the banquet-theory and apply it in detail to the Crucifixion, the Last Supper, and the Mass, so as to see whether the deductions that flow from it harmonize less artificially and more exactly with the formulas of faith than do those which are derived from the destruction-theory.

As a preliminary we must remember the distinction between a fact and the complexion placed upon it; between the death of Jesus for our redemption and the character of sacrifice that is attributed to it. The two things are quite separable in substance and in thought; although they have always been held in such close alliance as to make us feel that atonement for sin by means of blood-shedding is of its own nature a sacrifice in the strict sense of the word. But this is not so. The sacrificial character is an *ens rationis*, a manner of representing and apprehending a certain reality. The Sacred Passion might have been devoid of the character of sacrifice without being in any way less real or less efficient for our salvation; and on the other hand a ceremony might be strictly a sacrifice, although not including either loss of life or satisfaction for sin.

There are three different senses in which our Lord's death may be called a sacrifice. Morally and spiritually considered it is a supreme sacrifice by reason of the inward dispositions of our Lord's soul,—His generous dedication of His life to the service of those who had no claim on Him, His free consent to undergo so much, His sublime obedience to the Heavenly Father even unto death, and all those virtues through the example of which so many souls have been inspired and empowered to practise heroic deeds of relf-renunciation, labor, love, and suffering. From this point of view, the spiritual and not literal, our Lord may be called a sacrificing priest who immolated the Victim of the Cross, Himself. But it is necessary to keep the moral and the physical aspect of the work of Redemption carefully separate, so as to avoid the fate of those who mix their metaphors. It occasionally happens that one who is by the way of writing not devotionally but scientifically, confuses the two aspects, and makes use of the moral attributes of our Lord's Passion as evidence of its fulfilling the material conditions of sacrifice.

In a second sense the Passion and Death are the supreme,

although not literal, sacrifice: viz., *par excellence*, or κατ' ἔξοχην, or supereminently. This use corresponds to that of other words which we know only as they are exemplified in creatures, but which we apply to God to indicate infinitely surpassing realities; such are Spirit, Personality, Intelligence, Love. The Drama of Calvary has a special character of its own as the work of Redemption (apart altogether from its relation to the Last Supper and the Mass), and in this character it is correct to call it *supereminently* a sacrifice. It is not simply one example, the highest example, of the class, because it is so very much more than a sacrifice. It is the paramount event to which all divinely inspired sacrifices look in different ways, either prophesying it while future, or recalling it when it is in the past. It is the great reality which underlies all sacrifices, giving them their meaning and their efficacy. Everything that was figured by the oblations of the Jewish Temple was fulfilled in the Cross; all that is communicated to us or done by us in the Mass proceeds from the Cross as its fount and origin. The death of Christ for sin may be then regarded as the living principle in all the sacrifices of supernatural religions, and may in consequence be styled a sacrifice supereminently; this, however, has no relation to the sacrificial character of our Lord's Death in the third, the proper and strict sense of the word.

Sacrifice belongs to the category of ritual institutions. As such it is figurative of the great reality that is in supernatural religions; and is secondary to it, a memorial or representation of it. But the Crucifixion is no memorial or representation of anything else, and so does not possess this quality of sacrifice. Sacrifice is embodied in certain solemn ceremonial forms that are used in the worship of God. Now on Mount Calvary there was no liturgical expression of homage to God; on the contrary it was the crowning exhibition of man's hostility to the Lord and His Anointed One. Further there was no literal sacrificial action on Mount Calvary. The act of slaying, as we have seen, is not necessarily a priestly action nor even strictly a sacrificial act; and of this slaying in particular a high authority has said: "The Crucifixion performed by the soldiers was but a preparation, a condition of the sacrifice."[7] Sacred blood was indeed poured

[7] *Manual of Catholic Theology*, Vol. II, p. 460.

out, but it was not objectively applied in a sacrificial way to an assemblage of the faithful. The essential constituent of sacrifice, the common meal, was not present and was not possible, for the Victim was not in edible condition. No priestly function was performed by our Lord at that time, except in a moral and spiritual sense; and that is insufficient alone to constitute a literal sacrifice. The death of Jesus Christ is indeed of supreme importance for our salvation; it was the expiation of our sins; its influence is dominant in every sacrifice; but it is not, as considered simply in itself and independently of the Last Supper and the Mass, literally a sacrifice. Some positive operation on the part of the Son of God was necessary for the redemption of man; there was special fitness in His endurance of suffering and death; but there was no necessity for the redemptive operation to take the liturgical form of sacrificial worship; and as a matter of fact it did not take it, considered simply in itself.

Of all the series of events in the Passion the only one that presents the essential characteristics of sacrifice is the Last Supper, and there alone did Jesus act literally as priest. The Supper had all the adjuncts of sacrifice, such as the ceremony of ablution preceding it, and it was brought into significant conjunction with the important sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb. We find in it the consecrated Priest, the sacred meat and drink placed on the table in edible form, the blood-ceremony indicating a more intimate fellowship than the eating from the same dish, and the due effect of sacrifice, viz., the uniting together of God and the guests in the bond of physical and spiritual communion. There is no death indeed in it, nor symbol of death. The use of the two distinct species was not a rehearsing of the blood-shedding of the next day; it meant only the provision of the two materials of a complete banquet, food and drink. There was no more need to reproduce the act of killing the Paschal Lamb in the New Sacrifice than to reproduce the roasting of it. Further, there was not any necessity that the death of our Lord should have taken place previously; and even if the chalice had passed away after the Prayer in the Garden, and Jesus had not suffered death, the Last Supper would still be a full and perfect sacrifice.

With this complete sacrifice the events which occurred on

Calvary are brought to form a perfect unity and identity of operation. The Last Supper is not the supplement and completion of a sacrifice offered on Calvary; it could not be the completion of what had not yet begun. But the death on the Cross, not as yet being of itself a literal ritual sacrifice, is interwoven into the fabric of a sacrificial feast of the Body and Blood of Christ, and becomes an element in that sacrifice, and so receives a liturgical character. In consequence of the sacrificial feast having already taken place, the Crucifixion at once entered as a member into the liturgical composition, and acquired a literal sacrificial character. If the prime factor of sacrifice, the banquet, had been held in suspense until Jesus should have risen again, assembled the Apostles, and celebrated the meal, then His immolation on the Cross would have remained ritually incomplete, and indeed would have come to an end without being so completed.

The food of the Last Supper is not simply identical with the Divine Person who died, but, according to the words of institution, it was placed on the table and was eaten precisely as being the Body as it was broken and the Blood as it was shed on the Cross. The slaying and death, therefore, though not of the essence of sacrifice, but yet an invariable element of the Levitical rite, were made an integral portion of the sacrifice of the Cenaculum; so that there is full conformity to the sacrificial archetype which had been consecrated by so many centuries of use; and consequently we have in the Last Supper not only all the essentials of simple sacrifices, when it is considered in itself; but we also have, when it is taken in conjunction with the Crucifixion, all that is integral to Hebrew sacrifices.

On the banquet-theory, then, the case stands thus: the Cross and the Last Supper are not two forms of sacrifice of different orders which have the same Principal in both and unite in producing the same effect, and are made one simply in our apprehension of them; but they are two distinct parts of one and the same complex operation. Each requires the other in order to the completion of the whole. The death of Jesus is not a ritual sacrifice without the Last Supper; the Supper would only be an empty memorial of the last evening before the Passion, if it did not consist of the flesh and blood immolated on Calvary. The

Cross and the Supper are two parts of the one sacrifice separated by an interval of time and coalescing into one. Neither of them is a repetition of the other action, or a continuation of it, or a dramatic representation of it. There was no meal or quasi-meal on Calvary; there was no destruction or quasi-destruction in the Supper-room. There is no more need to imagine that the Victim was slain at the Supper and in the Mass, than that it was eaten on Calvary; and it is not more difficult to prove the one than the other. The Victim whose immolation took place on Calvary and was over within a few hours, was distributed as food in the Sacred Meal of the Cenaculum, and that same distribution is continued permanently in the Mass.

The Last Supper was the first Mass. Apparently the Supper was for the sake of the Mass, in order to make of it the perpetual Sacrifice of the New Covenant, and to bring the death of our Lord into union with it as one ritual act. Here is an obvious reason for God's action in imparting the sacrificial character to the redemptive operation of Calvary. The death of Christ was infinitely meritorious and efficient without the Last Supper. The liturgical form was not necessary to His death, except in view of a new and perpetual sacrifice in the Church; for it was not in itself, nor was it adapted to be, an act of solemn worship in which all men should join for the fulfilment of their social religious duty toward God. The Supper gave it a ritual form whereby it could be perpetuated as an act of worship.

In every organized religion there is needed some external ritual observance as a bond of union, a symbol of fundamental principles, an embodiment of doctrines, an expression of religious sentiments. The natural, immemorial, universal instrument of these purposes is the rite of sacrifice. Sacrifice is not less appropriate to modern than to ancient times, for the needs of human societies are always much the same; and we need to be constantly reminded of the Redemption that has been accomplished, just as much as Israel needed to have it constantly foretold, by an external rite. These functions of sacrifice have not been superseded by our Lord's atoning death, and they do not encroach upon it. Sacrifice is a commemoration of something ulterior to itself; the Crucifixion is the thing commemorated by them all.

Sacrifice is a public ceremonial, it does not claim to be redemption; it signifies redemption, but does not accomplish it. Some form of sacrifice may then exist without disparagement to the sacred Tragedy of Calvary, and some such form is required as part of the external equipment of religion.

The Great Sacrifice of the New Law was consummated in the Last Supper, with which the death of the Messias was incorporated. That Sacrifice is made permanent, universal, eternal, by the fact that the victim in the state of food being placed on the Altar of the Church, for ever remains there, never ceasing from this world for a single moment, and is always in process of distribution, binding the community into one with the Divinity. This prolongation of the essential part of the sacrifice is the Mass. Each Mass is a different liturgical ceremony, which has its beginning and its end; but through them all there runs the same continuous action of the High Priest abiding in the Church forever, and always engaged in dispensing the sacrificial food. Although there is no historical proof, there are liturgical and other reasons for thinking it probable, that the physical continuity of the sacred banquet by means of reservation of the species began from the moment of the Last Supper. If this be correct, the Body and Blood of Christ were actually in the sacrificial condition of edible food at the moment of their immolation on Mount Calvary, and His death actually then formed part of a ritual sacrifice.

In the Mass alone is fulfilled Malachi's prophecy about the glorifying of God's name by means of a clean oblation throughout the Gentile world. In the Mass alone is verified the threefold character of Christ as Priest, eternal priest, and priest of Melchisedec's order. In the Mass the efficiency of the Lord's death is exercised and applied; blood-brotherhood is established with each one individually in Holy Communion; and the graces of the Passion are bestowed, not immediately, but through that same ceremony: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me."[8] Through the Mass it is that the sacerdotal action of Jesus is not completed and closed like His death,

[8] St. John 6 : 57, 58.

but is in continuous being as propitiation, intercession, worship, and the offering of one sacrifice for sins while He forever sitteth on the right hand of God.[9]

The Mass exhibits all the essentials of sacrifice, although there is no slaying of the Victim in it, either as repeated, or continued, or simulated. There is the placing of food before the guests, the blood-rite, the joint partaking of the meal with God: "Ipse conviva et convivium: ipse comedens et qui comeditur;"[10] and in fine there is union with the Divinity, not in aspiration, or in promise, or in figure, but in the fullest and most real accomplishment bodily and spiritual.

The Mass then is the "true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice" of the New Law; with which the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross is really incorporated by being made one identical liturgical operation, through the real presence in it of the Body that was broken and the Blood that was shed.

I may conclude with two or three extracts from the exhaustive essay of the Very Rev. W. J. Kelly, already quoted. He corroborates several of the views herein set forth, although he does not pursue them to the same conclusion. "This testament was *confirmed* on Calvary, but not made on that occasion, for all the necessary conditions were fulfilled at the Last Supper and not on Calvary. . . . The sacrifice which He offered on Calvary was a fulfilment of the bloody sacrifice of Aaron; but it was not according to the order of Aaron, since Christ was not a priest according to the order of Aaron. Neither was that a sacrifice according to the order of Melchisedec, because the peculiarity of his priesthood was that he sacrificed bread and wine. Hence the resemblance of Christ to Melchisedec must be in the fact that He offered up bread and wine at the Last Supper; and as He is a priest *for ever* according to that order, He must for ever offer up a sacrifice corresponding to that of Melchisedec."[11]

"The Mass and the Sacrifice of Calvary are not distinct sacrifices, but they are successive acts of one and the same all-atoning sacrifice. Not only is there an identity of priest and victim, but there is a moral identity of oblation; for the act of oblation, begun at the Last Supper, was consummated on Calvary, and is prolonged

[9] Heb. 10: 12. [10] St. Jerome. [11] Page 240.

for ever in the Mass. As the Eucharistic Sacrifice was the prologue to the great drama of Cavalry, so also is it the epilogue . . . . The Mass may be regarded as the necessary complement to the Sacrifice of Calvary, since it is necessary to the integrity of sacrifice that the victim should be received in communion . . . The one immolation made on Calvary still continues as an element of sacrifice in the Mass; and between that one immolation and the constant offering in the Mass there exists a moral union."[12]

The foregoing views are deferentially offered for the examination of theologians, and are most humbly submitted to the supreme authority of the Church, in the hope that nothing will be found in them of profane novelty, contravening the revealed or defined truths of Religion.

† JAMES BELLORD,
*Bishop of Milevis.*

*Southend-on-Sea, England.*

---

## THE SYMPTOMS OF DEATH AS A CONDITION FOR ADMINISTERING THE LAST SACRAMENTS.

### A Physiologico-Theological Study.[1]

### III.—THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM TO FŒTUSES AND NEWLY-BORN INFANTS WHEN IN CONDITION OF APPARENT DEATH.

#### THE VERDICT OF MORAL THEOLOGY.

WITH a view to greater clearness in this important question, we shall first deal briefly with the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism to the fœtus or to the newly-born child.

It is the commonly accepted doctrine among modern physiologists that the human fœtus is informed by the rational soul from the first moment of conception. Hence from that same moment on the undeveloped child is capable of attaining to regeneration through Baptism. If then the fœtus shows certain signs of life on being expelled by any cause whatever from the womb, it

[12] *The Veiled Majesty*, pp. 233, 240, 289, 291.

[1] See ECCL. REVIEW August, pp. 168-172.

should be baptized. All present-day theologians agree on this point.

Theologians are likewise at one in holding that a fœtus or newly-delivered child probably alive ought to be baptized conditionally: "*Si vivis, ego te baptizo*," etc. Busenbaum asserts: "When there exists a doubt about the life of an infant, it should be baptized conditionally."[2] Gury maintains the same doctrine: "The general opinion of theologians," he says, "rightly favors the obligation of administering conditional baptism to a fœtus prematurely born."[3]

St. Alphonsus has the following: "When there is a doubt regarding the life of an unbaptized child, Baptism should be given conditionally. It is however the teaching of Natalis Alexander, that Baptism should not be given, unless the immature fœtus manifest some unmistakable sign of life. To warrant Baptism, he affirms, conjectural evidence of this fact is not enough. Natalis is right if he is speaking about the unconditional administration of the Sacrament. But if he refers to the conditional conferring of Baptism, the contrary opinion of Busenbaum, Cardenas, Croix, and many other eminent authors should rather be followed. They one and all declare that every fœtus of premature birth should be given conditional baptism, unless the absence of life in them be altogether incontrovertible."[4]

Ballerini-Palmieri sums up the above view in one sentence: "A fœtus which gives an evident sign of life should be baptized unconditionally; but conditionally, if no such sign appear."[5] The

[2] Busenbaum, *De Baptismo*, Dubium IV, Resp. IV.

[3] Gury, *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*, Vol. II, n. 247.

[4] "Si dubium sit an infans vivat baptizandus est sub conditione. Dicit Natalis Alexander, De Bapt. Prop. 3, R. 3, quod nisi appareat evidens signum vitæ in fœtu abortivo, non est dandus Baptismus, etiamsi adsit aliquod æquivocum signum. Si loquimur de Baptismo absolute ministrando, recte sentit Natalis: sed loquendo de Baptismo sub conditione conferendo, omnino dicendum cum Busenbaum, ut supra, et 'Salm. de Bapt.', c. 6, p. 1, n. 3, illum sine dubio ministrandum, quandocumque aliquod apparet dubium de vita prolis. Hinc optime censet Cardenas in 'Crisi' I, d. 15, c. 3: Ronc. c. 4, q. 4, r. 3, Mazzotta, t. 3, pag. 85, et Croix, l. 6, p. 1, n. 294, cum aliis AA. gravissimis, omnes fœtus abortivos, si per aliquem motum dent signum vitæ, et non constet esse anima destitutos, semper esse baptizandos sub conditione si vivant." Lib. 6, n. 124.

[5] Ballerini-Palmieri, Vol. IV, n. 751, ed. 3.

reason for this is that in the case of infants no personal disposition is required for the fruitful reception of the Sacrament of Baptism. Consequently, if they are living and have not received it, they will receive it both validly and fruitfully. It follows that when there is a probability of life, there is also a probability of salvation by the reception of the Sacrament. Given therefore a doubt or probability of life, and supposing the infant to be unbaptized, the baptism ought to be administered conformably to the principle "*sacramenta sunt propter homines.*" But since in the last-named contingency it is doubtful whether the Sacrament will produce its effect, as there is doubt about the child's being alive, and as Sacraments are for the living and not for the dead, out of respect for the Sacrament baptism is to be administered conditionally.

THE VERDICT OF MEDICO–PHYSIOLOGICAL EXPERTS TOUCHING THE CONTINUANCE OF FŒTAL AND INFANT LIFE IN CASES OF SUPPOSED DEATH.

We have seen that moral theology lays down clearly the obligation to baptize any fœtus or infant of recent birth, so long as there appears any manifestation of life, however dubious. It remains now to determine the extent of the probable continuance of life in such subjects, no matter how much appearances point to actual death.

In this connection the wise suggestion contained in the Pastoral Instruction of the diocese of Eichstädt may serve as a rule: "Non levibus quoque stabilita fundamentis opinio est, fœtus abortivos seu infantes recens-natos, licet prorsus nullum vitæ signum edant, dummodo nullum etiam corruptionis initium aliudve indubitatæ mortis signum appareat, sub conditione baptizari posse; cum experientia teste hujusmodi infantes, inter vere mortuos jam computati, impensa longanimi et aliquarum horarum cura ac fomentis adhibitis refocillati sint vitamque prodiderint; nam frequenter in partu asphyxiæ subjiciuntur, ac vita carere, ast non nisi falso, existimantur, immo nullum manifestum mortis signum in talibus infantibus nisi ipsam putrefactionem graves medici admittunt."[6]

According to Dr. Surbled,[7] the only certain signs of the death

[6] Instructio Pastoralis Eystettensis, n. 85, ed. 5. Friburgi-Brisgoviæ, 1902.

[7] *La Vie Sexuelle*, I, 5, C. 2.

of a fœtus are decomposition and putrefaction. Consequently, before these signs appear, it should be baptized *sub conditione*. "Not even the absence of all movement is a sure sign of death; decomposition or putrefaction is the only sign which admits of no mistake." A similar view was taken by the learned physician of Gerona, Dr. Vinader y Payrachs, in his *Discurso Medico-Moral.*[8] The same teaching is also found in Eschbach: "Infantes recenter natos et in vitæ discrimine positos, aut fœtus abortivos plane formatos, cum vel levissimus in eis motus apprehenditur, absolute baptizari oportet: cum autem sine motu et sensu iidem videantur, neque tamen adhuc corrupti aut putrefacti sint, sine mora baptizentur sub conditione: '*Si vivis, ego te baptizo*,'" etc.[9]

The basis of this doctrine is the fact that the fœtus and lately born infant frequently take on an appearance of death, lasting for hours or even days, during which interval it is impossible to perceive in them the ordinary phenomena of life, such as respiration, heart-beat, etc. Many such subjects have been resuscitated after hours and days of supposed death, and some even after actual interment.[10]

It should be noted, too, that in the case of fœtuses and newly-born infants other symptoms may easily be mistaken for the first indications of putrefaction.[11]

SOME REMARKABLE CASES IN PROOF OF THE FOREGOING DOCTRINE.

Dr. Grau y Martí, in the above-mentioned session of the Medico-Pharmaceutical Society of SS. Cosmas and Damian, held in Barcelona on January 15, 1903, gave an account of several remarkable cases, among them one of a fœtus that had been buried as dead, and *five* hours after burial was resuscitated; another of a fœtus that manifested slight beatings of the heart *twenty-three* hours after its supposed death. In the session of January 22, Dr.

[8] *Discurso Medico-Moral.*, tit. 19, pag. 190 ff., Gerona, 1785.

[9] Eschbach, *Quaest. Physiol. Theol.*, disp. 3, p. 2, c. 3, a. 3, ed. 2. *Cf.* also Alberti, *Theol. Past.*, pars prima, n. 7, Romæ, 1901; and Berardi, *Praxis Conf.*, vol. 3, nn. 845, 846.

[10] Eschbach, *l. c.*; Icard, *La Mort Réelle et La Mort Apparente*, Paris, 1897, pars 2, c. 6, a. 19, pag. 247 ff.; Debreyne, *Ensayo sobre la Teologia Moral.*, p. 3, chap. 2.

[11] P. Goggia, *Cosmos*, vol. 44, year 1901, p. 145.

Ruiz Contreras related a case that occurred in the Charité of Paris: "A woman gave birth to a child after a six-months' term of pregnancy. The fœtus had been pronounced dead, but I succeeded in revivifying it, and after being placed in an incubator it lived one or two days more."

To these cases of Dr. Grau y Martí and Dr. Ruiz Contreras must be added others cited by the French physicians Icard and Laborde: "How many children given up for dead," says Icard in the place quoted above, "have been found to be alive at the very moment they were going to be buried! One day, Portal, first physician of the king, received the body of a child that had been born in a state of suffocation. The tiny corpse lay for some time in the dissecting room before Portal began to prepare for an autopsy. When about to undertake the operation, it occurred to him to blow for a brief space into the child's mouth, with the result that after two or three minutes resuscitation took place. A similar occurrence was observed by an anatomist of Lyons, who reported it to Portal, by whom in turn it was communicated to Professor Depaul. Three cases which go to show the persistent vitality of children born in a condition of suffocation, were brought to the attention of the Gynœcological Society of Chicago by Dr. Goodell. After fruitless attempts at resuscitation the three children were pronounced dead by the physician and given up accordingly. The next day, as preparations were being made to bury them, all three were found to be alive. Another infant, after being worked on for an hour without result, was pronounced dead. After being placed in the coffin and left for twenty-four hours in a cold room, Dr. Marschka was able to perceive distinctly the beatings of the heart. What is more, it has been found possible to save the lives of children that had remained buried underground for several hours." Dr. Laborde[12] relates a number of instances of children apparently still-born who came to after a term of one or more hours, thanks to the process of rhythmical tractions of the tongue devised by Dr. Laborde himself. We give here a few of these cases. On January 10, 1892, Dr. Kristoyanaki reported to the Academy of Medicine of Paris a case that

[12] Laborde, *Les Tractions Rhythmées de la Langue*, VIII, pp. 76 ff, ed. 2, Paris, 1897, and VIII, 2d part, pp. 406-510.

came within his own experience. On November 25, 1891, after spending over an hour and a half in vain efforts to revivify a child, he had recourse finally to rhythmical tractions of the tongue, and succeeded in restoring life. A similar case is related by Dr. Massart, who on December 9, 1892, by the same method and after other means had been tried to no purpose, was able to resuscitate a child that was born without the least sign of life. Another case is that of a newly-born child which lay unattended to for a whole hour, in a state of seeming death through suffocation, and was finally revived through the efforts of Dr. Sorre of San-Malo. The first signs of returning life were noticed only as the doctor, who had employed rhythmical tractions for about *twenty minutes*, seemingly without results, was about to give the case up as hopeless. Dr. Delineau reports a similar case which came within his own personal experience, May 9, 1893.[13] It may be remarked that in this and other cases also, the child had been given up for some time as certainly dead; so that both the family and the nurse on seeing the doctor resort to the rhythmical tractions protested in chorus: "Leave the body of the little angel in peace." The doctor himself, after some time spent in applying this treatment of rhythmical tractions, was on the point of discontinuing it as not likely to succeed. Other instances may be read in Dr. Laborde's work, pp. 425-507, especially those on pp. 425-426, 429-431, 431-434, 444-446, 462-464, 477-478, 483-485, 490-492, 504-507. In the instance referred to on p. 429, etc., it was only after the child had been subjected for three-quarters of an hour to rhythmic tractions that it began to manifest signs of life; but half an hour more of the treatment was needed to procure complete resuscitation. So in the instance on p. 490, etc., an hour and a quarter had elapsed after the birth and three-quarters of an hour was spent in the rhythmic tractions before the child began to manifest any indication of life at all.

In conclusion we may mention a case which, though somewhat remote in date, cannot fail to be instructive. It is told by Icard. In 1748 a Dr. Rigadeaux was called to assist at the delivery of a woman who resided in a suburb of Douay in France. The call reached him at five o'clock in the morning, but it was

[13] Laborde, *l. c.*, pp. 134-136.

eight when he arrived. The woman had died two hours before without delivery. The doctor asked to see the body, which he found already in its shroud. With his own hands and without the need of any cutting he extracted from the womb the body of an infant to all appearances dead. After *three hours* of vigorous efforts to revive the infant he was on the point of giving up, when the infant gave signs of life and gradually came to. The doctor was preparing to leave the house *seven hours* after the mother had drawn her last breath, when he noticed that cadaveric rigidity had not yet set in. He had the shroud taken off, gave orders not to proceed to burial until the corpse became rigid, and in the meanwhile to stroke the hollow of the woman's hands from time to time, to rub her nostrils, eyes, and face with vinegar, and to keep her in her own bed. After two hours of this treatment the mother likewise revived, and on August 10, 1748, both mother and child were well and strong.[14]

Dr. Barnades, attending physician to the king of Spain, also refers to this case in a work written at Madrid in 1765, and published in 1775. Its title is[15] "A treatise on the danger existing in certain cases of burying persons alive without other signs of death than those generally accepted; and on the best means of restoring to life persons who have been drowned, hanged, frozen." On p. 122, etc., may be found other remarkable instances which confirm our statements.

## PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS.

The cases referred to above suggest some practical conclusions of great importance and frequent application.

The *first* concerns the obligation the physician is under to procure by all means in his power the resuscitation of a child that is born apparently dead, but without exhibiting certain signs of putrefaction.

Dr. Sorre, after instancing the case cited above as having come

[14] Icard, *l. c.*, pp. 221–222.

[15] "Instrucción sobre lo arriesgado que es en ciertos casos enterrar á las personas sin constar su muerte por otra señales más que las vulgares; y de los medios más conducentes para que vuelvan en si los anegados, ahogados con lazo," etc. See p. 278.

under his own experience, adds: "Let this case serve as a warning to those doctors who, when a child comes into the world without manifesting signs of life, do nothing more than make a few perfunctory efforts to induce respiration. How many children born in a state of apparent death would be restored to life if only more serious efforts were made in their behalf,—a course which is now rendered easier than ever by the simple and efficacious process of rhythmic tractions of the tongue." [16]

*Secondly*, there is an obligation incumbent on all those who assist at a delivery or abortion, to baptize at once a fœtus or newly-born infant seemingly dead, but without any sure indication of putrefaction. How many souls might by this means be raised to Heaven, who otherwise must remain forever deprived of the sight of God.[17]

In the *third* place, it is the duty of the priest, and especially of pastors and those who are charged with the care of souls, to impress upon the faithful, and married persons in particular, the duty, in all cases of abortion, of baptizing the fœtus, though only of a few days' growth; as also the duty of baptizing every child that is born in a condition of seeming death, no matter how much it has the appearance of a corpse, excepting only in the case when complete decomposition has taken place. We believe that negligence in this matter is frequent, since it is very easy, to the great detriment of God's glory and the loss of souls, to take newly-born infants for dead, and leave them without baptism.

In these cases baptism is administered, as has been said, under condition,—"*If thou art alive*, I baptize thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," the one who pronounces the words at the same time pouring water on the head of the child.

If there is question of baptizing a fœtus which was expelled prematurely from the womb, still enveloped in the so-called secundine membranes (amnion and chorion), it is first baptized on the surface of these membranes. But as a doubt may be raised about the validity of baptism administered directly on the secun-

[16] Laborde, *l. c.*, pp. 105–107.

[17] *Cf.* Florentini, *De hominibus dubiis, seu de abortivis baptizandis*, Venetiis 1760.

dine membranes, as it is not clear whether they are properly parts of the infant, it is afterwards immersed in water and the membranes peeled off with the fingers, the form of baptism being repeated in this way: "*If thou art alive and not baptized*, I baptize thee," etc. Then without delay the fœtus is to be taken out of the water.[18]

IMPORTANT OBSERVATIONS ON THIS TEACHING.

As abortive fœtuses and infants of recent birth are frequently in a state of apparent death, especially in case of sickness or difficult birth, they are thought to be dead within the womb, when in reality they are alive. "Never," says Dr. Barnades,[19] "is the judgment about the presence or the extinction of life so subject to error as in cases of the fœtus within the womb or in the act of deliverance." Barnades (p. 319) mentions cases in which doctors after a careful diagnosis have believed the infant dead, and crushed the skull to extract it from the mother's womb. On closer examination they were surprised to find the fœtus still alive, and that they themselves had been involuntary perpetrators of infanticide. It is plain then with what caution physicians are bound to act in this matter, never venturing to do anything which might directly occasion its death, lest by some chance it should be still living. They should also take pains to have the fœtus baptized as soon as possible. This was also Dr. Deventer's opinion, based upon personal experience and the experience of others, as Barnades remarks.[20] Let physicians ever bear in mind that, in accordance with the doctrine of theologians and decrees of the Sacred Office,[21] it is never lawful *directly* to procure abortion of a living fœtus, or to do anything from which its death may directly ensue, no matter how grave the danger in which pregnancy places the mother, or the fœtus, or both. A *premature artificial parturition*

[18] Cf. Eschbach, *l. c.*, p. 321; Debreyne, *l. c.*, p. 3, cap. I, No. 5; Villada, *Casus*, Vol. III, p. 261, 262, (ed. I); Capellmann, *Med. Pastor.*, p. 112, note; Dr. Blanc, "El Bautismo de Necesidad," articles published in *El Criterio Católico*, year 1899; Gury-Ferreres, *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, Vol. II, n. 249, q. 6; Alberti, *l. c.*; Berardi, *l. c.*

[19] *L. c.*, p. 316.

[20] *L. c.*, p. 324.

[21] Such decrees, are among others, those dated May 2, 1884, August 12, 1888, and July 21, 1895, etc.

is allowed when the offspring can live *extra uterum*, and the gravity of the case demands it.[22]

In the second place, as it frequently happens that after the mother's death the fœtus survives, so an obligation rests upon the physician to perform the cæsarean operation that the fœtus may be baptized and its life saved, should it be possible. This obligation to baptize does not cease to exist even in the case where pregnancy be but of a few weeks; since, as was stated above, the human fœtus is believed to be animated by a rational soul from the very first moment of conception.

"The Catholic physician," says Dr. Blanc, "is obliged to perform the cæsarean operation in all stages of pregnancy, beginning at least with the period when the embryo is distinguishable and has the form of a fœtus." According to Chausier and Marc this takes place on the forty-fifth day. As early as the thirtieth day the embryo may be distinguished, and is as large as a grain of barley.[23]

The law laid down in the Roman Ritual is quite decisive: "Si mater pregnans mortua fuerit, fœtus quamprimum caute extrahatur; ac si vivens baptizetur."[24]

The relatives of the deceased are obliged to permit, nay, even to request that such an operation take place.

The faithful, says the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, will not take it amiss that the body of the deceased mother be operated upon to administer Baptism, thus to save the eternal and perchance the temporal life of the child, when they call to mind that our Saviour permitted His Sacred Side to be opened with a lance for our salvation. It is unreasonable and impious to condemn to eternal death the living child for a stupid wish to preserve intact the dead body of the mother.

An obligation rests upon the priest, especially upon the pastor, to inform the faithful and physicians of their duty in this matter;

[22] See Sacred Office, May 4, 1898. *Cf.* Gury-Ferreres, *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, Vol. I, n. 401, etc.; Eschbach, *l. c.*, and *De Ectopicis Conceptibus* (Romae, 1894, p. 10 sqq.); *Disp. Phys. Theol.* (Romae, 1901, p. 452, etc.); Antonelli, *Medicina Pastoralis*, (Romae, 1905, Vol. I, n. 300, etc.).

[23] *Criterio Católico*, Vol. I, p. 354. See Aertnys, *Theol. Mor.*, lib. vi, n. 42.

[24] Consult the Plenary Council of Latin America, n. 492; St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, p. 3, Qu. LXVIII, Art. 11.

still he may not *command* that the operation take place, much less may he perform it.[25]

Some are of the opinion that the fœtus dies simultaneously with, or at most a few moments after, the mother. Nevertheless, there are cases on record where the fœtus has been found alive on opening the maternal womb many hours after death.[26]

Dr. Barnades[27] mentions several instances of children born without medical aid several hours and even two days after the mother's death, others after her very interment. The following instance happened at Segovia: Francis Arevalo de Suazo set out on a journey, during which his wife died with child. When he was informed of the sad news he returned home immediately, only to find that she had been buried that very day. He longed to see her for the last time and ordered the grave to be opened. But on opening it the cries of a child just born were heard. It was taken out and lived many years, and became mayor of Jerez.[28]

Since cases of apparent death are not uncommon in pregnant women, and since it is important—in order to secure the fœtus alive—that the cæsarean operation should take place as soon as possible, two points are to be borne in mind: (1) that there be certainty of the mother's death; (2) that the cæsarean operation, or any other operation deemed necessary, be performed with the same caution and care as in the case of a living mother, so that, if alive, she may not be killed, as unfortunately has taken place more than once.[29] Particulars which may be followed in these cases are described by Dr. Blanc.[30] He remarks that at times not only has the child been delivered alive, but even the mother, though apparently dead, has been restored to health.

We may conclude this chapter of our inquiry by mentioning a

[25] Both these regulations are found in the decrees of the Sacred Office, February 15, 1780, and December 13, 1889.

[26] Antonelli: *Medicina Pastoralis*, V. I, n. 309, etc. See also Dr. Blanc's article, "Doctrina Theológico-Moral sobre algunos puntos tocológicos," in the *Criterio Católico*, Vol. I, pp. 193, 225, 327, 353, etc.

[27] *L. c.*, p. 284, etc.

[28] Barnades, *l. c.*, p. 293; Dr. Blanc, *l. c.*, p. 325.

[29] See Barnades, *l. c.*, p. 308.

[30] *L. c.*, p. 356.

most instructive case which is found in Barnades,[31] and originally taken from Gaspar de los Reyes. There was a lady in Madrid, of the illustrious house of Lasso, who after a three days' agony died with child, according to the general belief, and was buried in the family vault. The fœtus had not been removed, because it likewise was thought to be dead. Some months later the tomb was opened, and the dead mother was found clasping a child in her right arm. Undoubtedly the unfortunate mother, on awakening from her trance, had brought forth her child, not to the light of day, but to the woeful darkness of the grave.

P. JUAN FERRERES.

*Tortosa, Spain.*

[31] *L. c.*, p. 330.

# Analecta.

## E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

### I.

DUBIA LITURGICA.

Hodiernus Calendarii Agennensis Redactor, de consensu Rev.mi sui Ordinarii, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia, pro opportuna solutione, proposuit:

I. An in Ecclesia, ubi S. Felix (14 Ian.) est Patronus vel Titularis, festum S. Hilarii reponi debeat, tamquam in sedem propriam, in diem 19 Ianuarii, quae est dies infra Octavam, cum de S. Canuto nihil sit agendum? Et quatenus *affirmative*, an Calendarium particulare huic responsioni contrarium sit corrigendum?

II. An dies 28 Ianuarii adeo sit propria festo SS.mi Nominis Iesu transferendo, iuxta decretum 6 Sept. 1895, ut hoc festum poni nequeat in diem 19 Ianuarii, quae est dies infra Octavam v. gr. S. Hilarii Patroni et Titularis quando nempe Dominica II post Epiphaniam incidit in diem 14 Ianuarii, ut anno proximo eveniet? Et quatenus *affirmative*, an Calendarium particulare sit corrigendum ut supra?

III. Utrum festum Purificationis cum Dominica Septuagesimae occurrens, transferri debeat in diem 4 Februarii, quando scilicet feria II seu die 3 Februarii occurrit festum Patroni vel Titularis seu duplex primae classis, vel ulterius transferendum sit in primam diem non impeditam iuxta Rubricas?

IV. Quando festum SS.mi Cordis Iesu die 29 Iunii occurrit, in diem 30 transfertur tamquam in sedem propriam. Quid vero in Ecclesia propria S. Pauli, cuius festum est primae classis et primarium? Utrum festum SS.mi Cordis transferri debeat iuxta Rubricas in proximam diem non impeditam, an potius in Dominicam, ne longius protrahatur, translato inde festo Pretiosissimi Sanguinis in feriam III sequentem?

V. An, ubi adest obligatio chori, si non cantetur Missa officio conformis, in Missa solemnitatis in Dominicam translatae fieri debeant commemorationes, et quaenam sunt illae commemorationes?

VI. An festo Patroni vel Tituli Ecclesiae occurrente cum Dominica in Albis vel Trinitatis, possit cantari Missa Patroni vel Tituli praesertim ubi non adest obligatio chori, quum hae duae Dominicae non annumerentur in Rubrica Missalis de Translatione festorum?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque sedulo perpensis respondendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative.*

Ad II. *Negative.*

Ad III. *Affirmative* ad primam partem, *negative* ad secundam.

Ad IV. Transferatur in Dominicam sequentem, translato festo Pretiosissimi Sanguinis D. N. I. C. in feriam III sequentem.

Ad V. Servetur Decretum n. 3754 *Declarationis Indulti pro solemnitate festorum transferenda* 2 Dec. 1891 ad II.

Ad VI. *Negative*, et serventur Rubricae reformatae Missalis Romani tit. VI *De translatione festorum.* et decreta n. 3754 uti supra ad III, et n. 3924 *Strigonien.*, 3 Iulii 1896 ad V.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 19 Maii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

## II.

REPROBANTUR CONSUETUDINES INDUCTAE RELATE AD USUM STOLAE IN CHORO ET PLUVIALIUM IN VESPERIS.

Rev.mus D.nus Ioannes Maura y Gelabert, Episcopus Oriolensis, vehementer exoptans ut Rubricae et Decreta, quae ad divinum cultum spectant, rite serventur, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi ea, quae sequuntur, humiliter exposuit:

In Cathedrali ecclesia Oriolensi inde ab anno 1626 adest consuetudo, vi cuius Canonicus Hebdomadarius utitur stola in omnibus Horis canonicis persolvendis. Item diebus in quibus iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum assumenda sunt pluvialia, accipiuntur hoc modo: Hebdomadarius habens stolam supra mozzetam, manet in habitu chorali usque ad hymnum infra cuius cantum accipit pluviale; duo beneficiati in festis minus solemnibus, simul cum duobus Canonicis in solemnioribus, illud accipiunt in principio Vesperarum, sed tam omnes isti quam Hebdomadarius pluviale assumunt in ipso choro quin in sacristiam conveniant; tempore vero incensationis idem Hebdomadarius associatur ad altare a duobus aliis Beneficiatis simplici habitu chorali indutis. Tandem in fine Vesperarum omnes, qui pluvialia asumpserunt, illa deponunt quin e choro egrediantur. Nunc vero cum circa legitimatem harum consuetudinum graves dubitationes exortae sint nuperrime et inter ipsos Capitulares non conveniat quid agendum sit, idem Ordinarius ad omnem ambiguitatem et inquietudinem e medio tollendam insequentium dubiorum solutionem a S. C. expetivit; nempe:

I. An huiusmodi usus stolae, saltem attenta perantiqua consuetudine, uti legitimus sit habendus ideoque servandus?

II. An vi eiusdem consuetudinis, Hebdomadarius possit manere in habitu chorali usque ad hymnum et tunc assumere pluviale?

III. An pluvialia in Vesperis solemnibus possint assumi et deponi in ipso choro quin necesse sit in sacristiam convenire?

IV. An, qui assistunt Hebdomadario tempore thurificationis, debeant esse iidem qui ab initio parati fuerunt, vel possint esse duo alii Beneficiati simplici habitu chorali induti?

V. An sustineri possit consuetudo, ut duo Canonici, absente

Episcopo, induantur pluvialibus ad fungendum munere assistentium in diebus solemnioribus prout in hac Cathedrali consuetum fuit pro Vesperis ?

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisita etiam sententia Commissionis Liturgicae, reque diligenter expensa, rescribendum censuit :

Ad I. *Negative* iuxta decretum n. 1275 *Dalmatiarum* 4 Augusti 1663 ad 3.

Ad II et III *Negative*, et servetur Caeremoniale Episcoporum, lib. II, cap. III, n. 1, 2, 3 et 4.

Ad IV. *Affirmative* ad primam partem ; *negative* ad secundam, et servandum Caeremoniale Episcoporum, loco citato n. 10.

Ad V. *Negative* iuxta decretum n. 1391 *Papien.* 20 Iulii 1669 ad 3.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 30 Maii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

## III.

CIRCA CELEBRATIONEM FESTI B. J. B. VIANNEY, PRO GALLIA.

Rev.mus D.nus Episcopus Vivariensis a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione humiliter postulavit :

I. An festum Beati Ioannis Baptistae Vianney possit celebrari etiam hoc anno iuxta Indultum seu decretum *Dioecesum Galliae* 12 Aprilis 1905 ?

II. An festum Beati I. B. Vianney, sub ritu duplici minori, celebrandum sit die quarta Augusti, quae est dies obitus Beati, et proinde festum S. Dominici, sub ritu duplici maiori, transferendum sit iuxta Rubricas, quia haec dies non est dies obitus S. Dominici ?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, respondendum censuit :

Ad I. *Affirmative*, si commode fieri potest.

Ad II. *Negative*, iuxta Decretum Generale n. 3811 *Super duobus festis seu Officiis eadem die occurrentibus* d. d. 21 Novembris 1893 ad II, et festum B. Ioannis Baptistae Vianney in casu esse transferendum in diem primam sequentem liberam iuxta Rubricas.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 12 Maii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

## IV.

### DE ANTICIPANDA SIVE PRIVATA SIVE CHORALI RECITATIONE MATUTINI.

Hodiernus Rev.mus Episcopus Placentinus in Hispania Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi reverenter exposuit:

Ex controversia, abhinc paucis annis exorta circa horam, qua Matutinum pro insequenti die incipi possit, asserentes quidam talem horam esse secundam pomeridianam, negantes alii, eamque protrahentes ad dimidietatem vesperae, prout in Directoriis dioecesanis praescribitur, quamdam anxietatem non parvipendendam oriri inter obstrictos ad Divinum Officium. Quapropter idem Rev.mus Episcopus sequentia dubia solvenda subiecit:

I. Utrum, in privata recitatione Matutinum pro insequenti die, incipi possit hora secunda pomeridiana, aut standum sit tabellae Directorii dioecesani omni tempore?

II. Utrum etiam in publica seu chorali recitatione officium incipi possit hora secunda pomeridiana?

III. Utrum hora recitandi Matutinum annumerari queat indiscriminatim ex meridiano circulo locali, aut ex meridiano circulo officiali dicto *Greenwich*, qui quidem anticipat horam circuli localis per tertiam horae partem plus minusve?

Et Sacra eadam Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, reque mature perpensa respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Consulantur probati auctores.

Ad II. *Negative*, nisi habeatur Indultum.

Ad III. Ad libitum.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 12 Maii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

# Studies and Conferences.

## OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:—

S. Congregation of Rites:

1. Decides a number of doubts regarding the liturgical transfer of feasts in the local calendar.

2. Prohibits the custom of using the stole and cope in the celebration of Vespers and other canonical functions.

3. Regulates the celebration of the feast of Blessed John Baptist Vianney in the dioceses of France.

4. Answers three questions touching the anticipation of Matins and Lauds at a certain hour.

## THE NOTION OF SACRIFICE.

### I.

*Editor*, The Ecclesiastical Review:—

Bishop Bellord's articles on the "Notion of Sacrifice" were in print when their lamented and gifted author passed to his reward. With his characteristic love of truth he expressed a desire that perfect freedom of discussion, whether in approval or in criticism of his theory, might be allowed in The Ecclesiastical Review. In acceding therefore to the Editor's request to state my views, I need not guard myself against what might otherwise seem an unchivalrous and somewhat indelicate proceeding, in criticizing the views of a Bishop so highly respected, so lately dead, who can no longer defend himself.

I propose to discuss the theory advanced by the Bishop in his articles quite objectively and on its merits; and I trust that nothing in my expressions may suggest a want of respect for the deceased prelate.

At the very outset of his thesis the Bishop states that "sacrifice belongs to the class of natural signs, and in its origin is not

the creation of convention or legislation" (July, p. 3). This is hardly to be admitted. If it were true, the notion of sacrifice would not be so difficult to define. It is confessedly one of the most obscure and puzzling problems in theology to obtain a precise definition of the meaning of sacrifice, and to say how that meaning is expressed. If it were a natural sign, as smoke is a natural sign of fire, or as a footprint is the natural sign indicating that a living being has passed over the ground, or as the hectic flush and wasting of bodily strength are natural signs of consumption, its meaning would not be easily misunderstood, but obvious and always the same. As a matter of fact, it is by no means so obvious, for in the long course of history the term has certainly varied in signification. Bishop Bellord rejects the more commonly received explanation of sacrifice, which he calls the *Destruction-theory*, and adopts that which, as an explanation of primitive sacrifice, has gained wide acceptance among modern students of origins, and which he distinguishes as the *Banquet-theory*. In brief, this theory explains the primitive meaning of sacrifice as a common sacramental meal shared in by the tribal god and his worshippers. The wide acceptance of this theory among students of early religious institutions is in great measure due to the writings of Wellhausen and W. R. Smith. The latter, in his book, *The Religion of the Semites*, thus explains the primitive meaning of sacrifice:—

"In the oldest sacrifices (the) meaning is perfectly transparent and unambiguous, for the ritual exactly corresponds with the primitive ideas, that holiness means kinship to the worshippers and their god, that all sacred relations and all moral obligations depend on physical unity of life, and that unity of physical life can be created or reinforced by common participation in living flesh and blood. At this earliest stage the atoning force of sacrifice is purely physical, and consists in the redintegration of the congenital physical bond of kinship, on which the good understanding between the god and his worshippers ultimately rests. But in the later stage of religion, in which sacrifices of sacrosanct victims and purificatory offerings are exceptional rites, these antique ideas were no longer intelligible; and in ordinary sacrifices those features of the old ritual were dropped or modified which gave expression to obsolete notions, and implied a physical transfer of holy life from the victim to the worshippers" (p. 400).

Professor George F. Moore, in Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica*, writes:[1]

"The scholars who contend that the sacrificial meal was primitively not a mere hospitable fellowship but sacramental communion in the divine life of a totem animal, do not maintain that the Israelites in Old Testament times regarded their sacrifices in any such way; the most that would be claimed is that certain survivals in the cultus and superstitions without it point to this as the original character and significance of the sacrificial feast."

It is evident from these utterances that the writers who are the chief supporters of the *Banquet-theory* do not maintain that the crude, primitive meaning always remained unchanged. The meaning, they hold, underwent gradual alterations in the course of the development of religion, nor could a developed system of true religion have possibly approved of sacrifice in so primitive and restricted a sense. Such conceptions bear the essential mark of a degraded and savage condition of life. Sacrifice then must be considered to be not a natural but a conventional sign of worship offered to God; and this is the almost unanimous teaching of theologians.[2]

It may indeed be admitted that sacrifice is a suitable mode of expressing the ideas and feelings which belong to the worship of God, and that man is naturally inclined to make use of it in public divine worship. Such an assumption would explain the universal prevalence of sacrifice in all ages and places among mankind. Withal it appears to be a conventional sign, such as words in human language; and in this case its meaning depends on usage, convention, or authority. Nor may we lose sight of this important feature of sacrifice when we seek to discover its essential notes. It is the absence of authoritative institution which prevents us from calling the deaths of the martyrs so many distinct sacrifices, while the decree of the Eternal Father constituting the death of our Lord on the Cross an atonement for sin, and an act of reconciliation, makes that death essentially a sacrifice.

If sacrifice is a conventional sign, depending for its meaning,

[1] Article *Sacrifice*, n. 42.

[2] St. Augustine, *De civit. Dei*, X, c. 18; De Lugo, *De Euch.*, XIX, n. 12.

like words, on public or authoritative institution, then Bishop Bellord's application of the historical method to elucidate the meaning of sacrifice would seem somewhat exaggerated.

"In order to arrive," he says, "at a correct estimate of any institution of great antiquity that has been gradually developing from the first, it is necessary to trace it back through all its phases to its primitive and even barbarous beginnings, to inquire what it consisted of and how it worked, what additions have been made to it, and how much has dropped away from it. No detail is so rude or so distorted as to be without its uses in interpreting the beliefs, laws, rights, or customs of the nations of the present world. The historical method applied to theological speculation has given us certain facilities that the most acute and cultivated minds of mediæval times did not possess. In default of a knowledge of antiquity they were sometimes unable to draw out the simple original meaning of certain forms or customs, and so they forced into them all sorts of subtleties of their own devising" (July, p. 2).

Details collected from the religious usages of savage tribes and the idolatrous nations of antiquity may indeed serve to illustrate the meaning of sacrifice as it was instituted by God in the Mosaic and Christian dispensations; those details, especially when they imply false and revolting notions of God, can scarcely avail to determine its meaning. The crude, savage, anthropomorphic meaning which, according to W. R. Smith, belonged to primitive sacrifice, is expressly rejected in the Old Testament. "If I should be hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof. Shall I eat the flesh of bullocks? or shall I drink the blood of goats? Offer to God the sacrifice of praise: and pay thy vows to the Most High."[3]

If then by "historical method" we understand the laborious collection of endless and perpetually changing details concerning the religious usages and beliefs of primitive and degraded savages, such an application of the historical method to settling the question of the meaning of sacrifice in the revealed religion of the Old and New Testament is not likely to be productive of much fruit. Dr. Bellord's illustration from natural history seems out of place

[3] Ps. 49: 12-14. *Cf.* Is. 1: 11; Mich. 6: 6.

and likely to lead anyone astray who should be influenced by it.

Again he writes :—

"In making a classification of any set of objects, it will occasionally happen that the most prominent characteristics are very far from being the ones which determine the true arrangement into genera and species. The outer form and life-habits of an animal, the element it moves in, its method of progression, whether by swimming, flying, crawling, or walking, these do not exhibit its line of descent, and its affinities. The important factor is perhaps something subordinate or latent, such as the temperature of its blood, its oviparous or viviparous character, some aborted or atrophied portion of its frame" (*ibid.*).

This would hold, if sacrifice were a natural sign and dependent for its signification on the result of natural development; we have seen that it is a conventional sign which in great measure owes its meaning to the authority which instituted it. In adopting sacrifice and applying it to the worship of the true God, the revealed religion of the Old Testament rejected the false notions belonging to pagan sacrifice, and at the same time in large measure explained its meaning as used in the worship of the Jews.

But even if in the sense of Bishop Bellord we apply the historical method to discover the essential meaning of sacrifice, we find that there are several different interpretations of the facts. Perhaps a majority of scholars do favor the *Banquet-theory*, as Bishop Bellord calls it, but many distinguished students of origins hold other theories. Thus E. B. Tylor maintains that the primitive meaning of sacrifice was a gift or a present made by his worshippers to their god with the same object as they made presents to powerful chiefs or headmen.[4] Herbert Spencer held the same opinion.[5] It is approved of, as giving a general and provisional explanation, by Fr. Lagrange in his recent book *Études sur les religions Sémitiques*.[6] The author of the article on "Sacrifice" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* criticizes the *Banquet-theory* as applied to Semitic religions as follows : —

[4] *Primitive Culture*, II, p. 356.
[5] *Principles of Sociology*, sect. 139.
[6] P. 249.

"The Wellhausen-Smith contribution to the evolutionary account of Semitic sacrifice is a brilliant piece of work which has profoundly influenced research in cognate fields. But the attractiveness of the ingenious combinations, supported as they are by vast and *recherché* erudition, necessitates a reminder of the extremely speculative and precarious character of many of the positions. The theory credited to Semitic heathenism in its primitive stage, as already pointed out, is highly problematical. The construction in question postulates the idea of a communion between the god and the worshippers due to their assimilating the same food, but it cannot be held to be proved that this natural enough idea sprang ultimately from a theory that the sacrifice was efficacious because the victim was akin to both. Further, if the god and his votaries were already kin, it is not clear that their union could be more closely cemented by eating an animal which imported into the union no more than was already found in it. As regards the genealogical scheme, while Smith makes the holocaust a late derivative, and by a complicated process, from the sacramental meal, the truth is that the two types are always found existing side by side,—among the Phœnicians as well as among the Hebrews; and, so far as historical evidence goes, there is no strong reason for according priority to either. A weakness of Smith's position is that his exposition of primitive Semitic ideas is largely based on late Arab practice; and the next stage must be to test his speculations by the results of the researches now being actively prosecuted in the older field of Babylonian and Assyrian worship" (p. 332).

Obviously, then, we have no reliable results so far. But even if the historical method proved that sacramental communion was the essential element in the sacrifices of primitive man, this certainly did not continue to constitute the essential element of all sacrifice in historical times. There were many kinds of sacrifice both among the Jews and among heathen nations in which sacramental communion had no place at all. In the sacrifices offered to the sea, to rivers, or to springs by casting objects into the water, in the Jewish sacrifice of the red heifer,[7] of the priest's sin offering for personal sin,[8] and in holocausts generally, sacramental communion was no part of the rite. Bishop Bellord indeed quotes Fr. Kelly in proof of his assertion that the indispensable condi-

[7] Num. 19. [8] Lev. 6: 23.

tion of communion was fulfilled in the case of holocausts among the Jews by partaking of an offering of cake made at the same time (July, p. 5). Even if we admit that this action would suffice to make them partakers of the sacred victim, the statement seems lacking in authoritative confirmation.

The most serious objection, however, to the *Banquet-theory* remains to be noticed. If the essence of sacrifice lies in a sacramental meal, then, since there was no such meal on Calvary, our Lord's death upon the Cross was not a sacrifice in the true and literal sense. Bishop Bellord admits and insists on this conclusion from his theory. He allows, of course, that by His death on the Cross our Lord atoned for sin and redeemed us. He admits that our Lord's death may be called a sacrifice in a moral sense, inasmuch as it was an heroic act of self-renunciation and love for God and man. It is true also, he says, that it was a sacrifice supereminently, because it was so very much more than a sacrifice; it may be regarded as the living principle in all the sacrifices of supernatural religions. But still "there was no literal sacrificial action on Mount Calvary." "Sacred Blood was indeed poured out, but it was not objectively applied in a sacrificial way to an assemblage of the faithful. The essential constituent of sacrifice, the common meal, was not present, and was not possible, for the Victim was not in edible condition. No priestly function was performed by our Lord at that time, except in a moral and spiritual sense; and that is insufficient alone to constitute a literal sacrifice. The death of Jesus Christ is indeed of supreme importance for our salvation; it was the expiation of our sins; its influence is dominant in every sacrifice; but it is not, as considered simply in itself and independently of the Last Supper and the Mass, literally a sacrifice" (*supra*, p. 268).

This seems to me very difficult to reconcile with the teaching of Holy Scripture, of the Councils of the Church, and of theologians. It is, I think, the universally accepted doctrine in the Church that not only did our Lord atone for sin and redeem us by His death on the Cross, but that that death constituted a sacrifice in the strict sense of the term. This would appear to be taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Chapters 5–10. There it is expressly laid down that our Lord is a true priest, that He

offered sacrifice in offering Himself, for every high-priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices. Jesus as the high-priest of the New Testament offered up not the blood of goats or of calves, but His own Blood. The sacrifice of His Blood thus offered by Him is more efficacious than the blood of goats or of calves or the sprinkled ashes of the red heifer; it cleanses our consciences from sin. Christ's Blood is the sacrificial blood by which the new covenant was sealed, as the blood of sacrificed goats and calves was of the old covenant. By the sacrifice of Himself once in His Passion He has destroyed sin, for He was offered once to cancel the sins of many. The sacrifices of the Old Law were but shadows of that to come. Jesus Christ abrogated them by offering Himself, the real Victim of which they were but the types. We are sanctified by the bloody oblation of the Body of Jesus Christ made once on the Cross. By this one sacrifice He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

Thus we see that in these chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews the doctrine that by the death of Christ on the Cross our sins are atoned for, and that that death was a sacrifice, the real, true Sacrifice of which those of the Old Law were but the figures, is insisted on over and over again. Theologians and Catholic commentators have always explained them in this sense.

The same doctrine is taught by the Council of Trent, Sess. XXII. "God, our Lord, then, although He was about to offer Himself once to God the Father on the altar of the Cross by dying for us, that He might redeem us . . . wishing to leave the Church a sacrifice by which that bloody sacrifice which was once offered on the Cross might be represented, and its memory preserved to the end of the world, and its salutary efficacy for the remission of our daily sins applied," etc. (Chap. I). "And since in this divine sacrifice which is offered in the Mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner, who by shedding His Blood offered Himself once on the altar of the Cross . . . One and the same Victim offers Himself now through the ministry of priests who then offered Himself on the Cross, the two sacrifices differ only in the manner in which they were offered. The fruits of the bloody sacrifice on the Cross are most plentifully received by means of this unbloody sacrifice, which is far from derogating from it in any way," etc. (Chap. II).

Thus, according to the Council, the Sacrifice on the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass, first offered at the Last Supper, are two distinct sacrifices; that of the Mass represents and applies the fruits of the Bloody Sacrifice on Calvary.

It is unnecessary to quote the Fathers and theologians who all teach the same doctrine, as Suarez asserts.[9] Bishop Bellord does indeed strive to preserve to an extent the doctrine that our Lord's death on the Cross was a sacrifice by connecting it with the Mass, where we have the true sacrificial meal.[10] This device however does not seem to satisfy the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or of the Council of Trent, or of the Fathers and theologians, according to which, as we have seen, our Lord's death upon the Cross was in itself a true sacrifice by the shedding of His Blood.

Dr. Bellord says that the common definition of sacrifice according to the *Destruction-theory* has been framed by theologians with a view to safeguarding their teaching concerning the Mass, rather than drawn from a wide induction embracing all possible instances of sacrifice (July, p. 4).

This charge is sufficiently answered by quoting a few examples of definitions framed by recent writers who certainly have no such doctrinal prepossessions to safeguard. This is the definition of sacrifice given in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*: "We define sacrifice as an act, belonging to the sphere of worship, in which a material oblation is presented to the Deity *and consumed in His service*, and which has as its object to secure through communion with a Divine Being the boon of his favor."[11] The *Encyclopædia Biblica* says: "The term sacrifice may with etymological propriety be employed of all offerings to God; in common use it denotes specifically that class of offerings in which a victim is slain, corresponding to the Hebrew *zebah* (lit. slaughter)." W. R. Smith in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* writes as follows: "All gifts of this kind (drawn from the stores on which human life is supported) which are not merely presented to the god *but consumed in his service*, fall under the notion of sacrifice."[12]

The destruction or quasi-destruction of the victim was con-

[9] *De Incarnat.*, disp. 46, sect. 1; St. Thomas, *Summa*, III, q. 48, a. 3.
[10] P. 272. [11] Sacrifice, *l. c.* [12] S. V. Sacrifice.

sidered by these recent writers, who have no dogmatic prepossessions and who are fully acquainted with the results of modern research, an essential element of sacrifice. It is evident then that the data which have recently been brought to light by students of the history of primitive man and of archæology did not prevent them from adhering to the old and received definition, nor need we assume that the manifestations of ancient religious notions will modify the views of the Catholic theologian to any greater effect, so as to make him set aside the traditional view of sacrifice against which Bishop Bellord argues.

T. SLATER, S.J.

*St. Beuno's College, N. Wales.*

II.

*Editor*, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:—

Cardinal Newman says that much controversy may be avoided by clearness of definition. If we do not agree in the definition of Sacrifice, we of course cannot agree in the application of that definition to individual cases.

Having read carefully the two articles you forwarded on "The Notion of Sacrifice," I am far from being convinced that the new idea is nearer the truth than the old. The author's syllogism is about as follows: In the history of sacrifice the idea and practice of completing the offering by a feast were primitive and universal; therefore, the Banquet-theory sets forth the fundamental and essential feature of sacrifice. Now, although we grant that the partaking of the sacrifice was universal and primitive, it need not on that account be looked upon as essential, but rather as incident to the offering and physical or moral immolation of what was offered. While we hold that in the Mass the Communion is primitive, yet we may logically as well as theologically maintain that the fundamental and essential part is the Consecration.

Sacrificial language seems opposed to the Banquet-theory. The curious extremes of meaning in *sacer* and ἅγιος—*i. e.*, sacred and also accursed—are not very far apart when we call to mind that what was sacred to the gods was looked upon as devoted to destruction in being offered to them. In like manner *facere*,

ῥέζειν, עָשָׂה, used absolutely in the sense of to offer sacrifice, עֹלָה, a holocaust—not to mention others—have nothing in their meaning suggestive of a banquet. I may mention, by the way, that popular usage is in perfect harmony with the old idea that the essence of sacrifice consists in some sort of immolation. The "sacrifice hit" is an instance.

The monuments and the literature of antiquity show the priest, not at the head of the table playing the part of the generous host, but rather at the altar offering the victim of atonement to appease the anger of the gods. The "Bil nikani"—*i. e.*, the Lord of victims—is the strong language of the Assyrian deluge tablets to designate the priest in his true sacrificial character.

The assumption that the essence of sacrifice consists in some sort of feast leads necessarily to the conclusion that where there is no feast there is no true sacrifice. This touchstone is applied to the great central fact to which the Old Testament looked forward in hope, and the New looks back in gratitude—the Crucifixion. According to the new theory of sacrifice, even the death of Christ on the Cross was not, properly speaking, a sacrifice, except inasmuch as it was related to the Mass. Hitherto the Mass was measured, so to speak, by its relation to the death of our Lord on Calvary; now, however, we must reverse the order and refer the latter to the former. The author plainly says: "The death of Jesus Christ . . . is not, as considered simply in itself and independently of the Last Supper and the Mass, literally a sacrifice" (*supra*, p. 268). Yet St. Paul writes: "For Christ, our Pasch, is sacrificed" (ἐτύθη) (I Cor. 5 : 7)—"And gave Himself an offering and a sacrifice" (προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν) (Eph. 5 : 2). In these passages—not to speak of the reference to the Paschal Lamb—he uses the ordinary word for offering up a victim, so that he can hardly mean that Christ's death was a sacrifice in only a limited or relative sense.

That our Lord did not strike the fatal blow that deprived Him of life is no objection to the sacrificial character of His death; for the Roman soldiers—just as the *cultrarius* did in pagan sacrifices—placed the physical act, while He as Priest and Victim gave to it all its dignity and merit. The one thing that we can hardly lose sight of is that the death of Christ on the

Cross was a real sacrifice, as is clear from Scripture and tradition; and that the Mass is in its essence the same Sacrifice continued in an unbloody manner throughout all ages. The difficulty of explaining how all the requisites of sacrifice are found in the Mass cannot justify us in setting aside the solid and practically unanimous teaching of the past, that our Divine Lord is immolated on our altars and becomes our food, but in such a manner that the *ratio sacrificii* is found precisely in the act of immolation.

If the Banquet-theory be true, it is certainly strange that philology and liturgy and history and theology have come to look upon the repast as incidental and immolation as essential, and that St. Paul makes the latter so prominent in the priestly office, whilst almost, if not quite, overlooking the former.

Mindful of *in omnibus caritas* and *novitates devitans*, with best wishes, I remain

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. TIERNEY.

*Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, Md.*

## III.

*Editor*, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:—

I avail myself of the permission and invitation which you have kindly extended to me to make a few remarks on the articles on "The Notion of Sacrifice" in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, with the qualification that I have not had time to study them in all their details as they deserve.

From a cursory reading, and leaving it to those who have made theology a special and continuous subject of study to affix the proper note, I have no hesitation in saying that the new doctrine contained in the articles is to me "male sonans."

1. I do not see how "modern researches in the sand-buried ruins of Chaldea and in the coral islands of the mid-Pacific" can help us to a better understanding of Christian worship. If we are to appeal to archæology, it must be to the archæology of the "People of God," not of paganism; and to understand "the worship which has been celebrated by the Church for twenty centuries" it seems to me essential to take account of the notion of sacrifice

current under the Mosaic Dispensation, and of the ideas on the subject prevalent at the time of our Lord's coming to fulfil the Law.

2. From the articles in question I gather that the writer maintains the offering of Himself by our Lord on Mount Calvary was not of itself a sacrifice, and He *had* to institute the Eucharist as a common-social meal in order to establish a perpetual sacrifice under both heads.

3. To use the terminology of the writer, in the Destruction-theory there is not a sacrifice, but in the Banquet-theory there is such, to the exclusion of the other. This appears to me to approach, if not to be actually identified with, the doctrine of the Reformers of the sixteenth century. When Lutherans and Calvinists have grasped the results of modern researches in the coral islands of the Pacific and elsewhere, as the writer of the articles has done, I have no doubt they will be prepared to admit the reality of a true sacrifice in the "Lord's Supper." This will pave the way for the reunion of Christendom on this point, and will show that the Reformers were in the right, and that the Catholic Church in the Council of Trent was in the wrong.

4. I am unwilling to think that the notion of worship prevalent in the Church, and the teaching of Fathers and theologians of all ages can be corrected by articles in an ecclesiastical review at this time of day. The writer has taken advantage of the discrepancies among theologians as to what constitutes the "ratio sacrificandi" in the Mass (which all maintain to be a true and real sacrifice) to substitute the Banquet-theory as a sufficient and better explanation. The discrepancies of Catholic theologians do not require this substitution; and in my opinion the new theory bristles with difficulties greater than those which have divided the Schola Theologorum. For my own part I adhere in this matter to the teaching of the late venerable and learned Cardinal Franzelin, from whom I received my instruction.

I am, dear Mr. Editor,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CANON SMITH.

*St. Mary's, Stirling, Scotland.*

## IV.

The following brief critique of Bishop Bellord's theory is from the pen of Father Augustine Lehmkuhl, S.J. It fell to the lot of the accomplished moral theologian of Valkenburg (Holland) to complete and edit the second volume of P. Sasse's great work on the *Sacraments*, after the latter's death in 1897. That portion of the whole work which treats in the main of the Blessed Eucharist had previously been published.

Commenting upon the "Notion of Sacrifice" as expounded by the late Bishop of Milevis in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Father Lehmkuhl writes:—

I have read the articles of the Right Reverend Bishop, and I apprehend that the theory which he undertakes to expound will not escape criticism. I confess that I have not made sufficient and special examination of the historical bearings of the theory to permit me to give a detailed critique of the same. The principal grounds on which I should object to the view is the last argument advanced by the eminent author, in which he draws the conclusion—a conclusion which indeed follows necessarily from his premises—that the sacrifice of the Cross is not a true and real sacrifice in its essential elements (*in und aus sich*), but becomes such only through the Last Supper. This theory directly reverses the generally accepted teaching of Catholic theologians, according to which the Sacrifice of the Cross is the essentially true and real act of sacrifice (*in und aus sich*), whereas the Eucharistic act derives its sacrificial character from its *essential* relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, or in other words becomes a real sacrifice by reason of the relation which it bears to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

AUG. LEHMKUHL, S.J.

*Valkenburg, Holland.*

The discussion on Bishop Bellord's view of Sacrifice will be continued in the October number of the REVIEW.—EDITOR.

---

## THE ARCHBISHOP OUTSIDE HIS OWN DIOCESE.

*Qu.* If an archbishop assists at solemn functions in a cathedral or parish church outside his own diocese, must the cross be borne before him and does he wear the *cappa magna* on entering the church?

*Resp.* Within his own *province*, that is to say in any church under the jurisdiction of his suffragans as well as in his own diocese, an archbishop is entitled to have the cross carried before him, unless a higher dignitary (cardinal) is present. He also en-

joys the privilege of wearing the *cappa magna* anywhere within his archiepiscopal province. He may not of course exercise pontifical functions in another diocese, even of his own province, without the consent of the Ordinary. The same consent is required for the use of the crozier by the archbishop if he happen to assist in mitre and cope during solemn functions in a church of his suffragans.

---

## RED SLEEVES FOR ALBS.

*Qu.* There is a custom in some churches and in many convents of using albs that have a colored lining under the lace-work of the sleeves, suggestive of a cardinal or episcopal dignitary. Are such albs permitted, and may a simple priest make use of them?

*Resp.* There is no rubric forbidding the use of such albs, since the distinction between simple priests, and bishops, and cardinals is otherwise marked during the celebration of Mass.

The Sacred Congregation when asked this question replied: "Consuetudinem utendi fundo colorato sub velo translucenti in fimbriis et manicis Albarum tolerari; quoad manicas autem in rochettis fundum esse posse coloris vestis talaris relativae dignitatis." (S. R. C., July 12, 1892, ad 5, n. 3780; Nov. 24, 1899, ad 7, n. 4048.)

---

## THE PRIVILEGE OF WEARING THE MOZETTA.

*Qu.* May a domestic prelate who has the privilege of wearing the *mozetta* use the same in administering the Sacraments in church or when preaching? Are there any restrictions in the use of the *mozetta* outside his own parochial church or diocese?

*Resp.* The use of the mozetta is strictly prohibited in the administration of the Sacraments; even when the rochet is used the surplice and stole must be worn over the same. When preaching, the mozetta may be worn by those who enjoy the use of it, but only in their own parish church and not at all outside their own diocese. (S. R. C., July 12, 1892, n. 3784.)

## IS A PARENT'S WILL ANNULLED BY THE SUBSEQUENT BIRTH OF A CHILD?

*Qu.* Recently there died here suddenly a man who left a considerable amount of property. An autograph will was found by his eldest daughter, in which he had, some years ago, bequeathed his estate in equal portions to his children. Subsequent to the date of the will he had remarried, and a young child was born, for which no provision had, of course, been made in the will. The old will had not been registered, or even attested by the required witnesses, although it would be easy to prove its authenticity, because it had been written on a leaf of one of the personal account-books of the man in his undoubted handwriting. The widow has sufficient property in her own right, and is not disposed to litigation if the will has any validity binding her conscience to its observance. The daughter who discovered the will, although a direct beneficiary of it, is of the same disposition; and asks whether she should make any attempt to have the will recognized by the Orphans' Court. What do you think?

I think you would oblige many of your readers by giving a brief survey of the ordinary provisions of the law (moral and civil) in testamentary matters in general. Many of us find it difficult, if not impossible, to look up the verdict of theologians or the decisions of the civil courts.

*Resp.* The limitations of the will, even if it had been registered and properly attested, would not urge its observance in conscience upon those to whom the testator placed himself under obligations after having made it. Hence the widow is free to ignore its existence, whether the provisions be to her advantage or not, at least so far as her conscience enters into the matter. Furthermore, the civil law ordinarily considers revoked a will made under such circumstances. Therefore both parties would be justified in considering the man to have died intestate, and they might act accordingly and leave the disposal of the estate to the civil law.

The subject of last wills has been treated on several occasions in the REVIEW. We find, however, some admirable hints, collected by Fr. Tanquerey in his *Synopsis Theol. Moralis et Pastoralis*, published last year, and we are glad to reprint them here for the benefit of priests on the mission who cannot readily inform themselves about such matters.

## THE MAKING OF LAST WILLS.

### The Maker of the Will.

Who is authorized to make a will?—All persons of *sound mind*, except *infants* and *married women*, whose competency is somewhat restricted. (*a*) The soundness of mind such as will enable a person to make a will depends upon the business to be transacted; hence the testator's mind must have been sound with reference to whatever is involved in this transaction; he is supposed to have been able to understand the character of his property, and his relations to those persons who are about him and to those who would naturally have claim on his remembrance; he must have been capable of understanding the nature of the act he was doing, and free from any delusion brought about by weakness or disease, or which would or might lead him to dispose of his property otherwise than he would have done if he had properly known and understood what he was doing. Therefore the will of an idiot, a lunatic, or an insane person is invalid when he is wholly without mental powers or self-control, or when the character of its provisions is such as he could not have comprehended it, or when it is made under the influence of some delusion, or in obedience to an impulse at once unreasonable and irresistible, or under the pressure of external conditions which perverted his judgment or exercised such undue influence over his testamentary act as to render it not entirely voluntary.[1] The power of making a will must exist during the making of the testament; subsequent incapacity does not invalidate the will.

(*b*) With regard to *infants*, at common law they cannot devise real property, but may make a will of personal property at 14, if males, and at 12, if females. This has been modified in the *United States* by certain statutes which allow a greater capacity to infants.

(*c*) *Married women* at common law could not make a valid will, and marriage revoked their wills already made. But now it

[1] Robinson, *American Jurisprudence*, Sect. 36. To break a will for *drunkenness*, it must be proved by contestants not only that the testator was intoxicated, but also that he did not comprehend what he was doing.

is otherwise. *In England*, by virtue of the *New Wills Act*, married women have the fullest power of devise in regard to property held in their own right. *In most of the States of the Union* the wife's will made before marriage is no longer revoked by marriage, and she may as a rule bequeath her individual property if unmarried. Besides, she can make a will in favor of her husband, and such a will is no longer revoked by her second marriage.[2]

### The Heir by Law.

Who may benefit by a will?—Generally speaking, any person, even infants, wives, insane persons, except those expressly prevented by law. Now as a rule *witnesses* subscribing to the will cannot be legatees, unless they are creditors whose debts are by the will made a lien on the real estate. *Corporations* can receive by will only to the extent allowed by their charter. In a few American States *aliens* are still debarred from the privilege of being legatees. In most of the States a testator may cut off his children, if he pleases; but in some the law provides that if a child is not mentioned in the will, he shall take the same share of the estate as he would have been entitled to if his parent had died intestate. This accounts for the familiar provision of a legacy to a child of one dollar, so as to satisfy the letter of the law by mentioning the child's name.

### Property Subject to Bequest.

What property may be bequeathed?—As a rule all the property, real or personal, that one owns after all the debts have been paid. Formerly, at common law, the testator could dispose only of the property already acquired at the time of making the will; but now, in England as well as in most States of the Union, one may dispose by will of all real and personal estate, legal or equitable, to which he or she shall be entitled at the time of death. There are, however, certain kinds of property, such as the homestead or a life-insurance policy, that are devisable only under certain conditions, for which it may be necessary to consult a lawyer.

[2] Browne, *Domestic Relations*, pp. 54, 55.

## Legal Forms of Wills.

Two kinds of wills are recognized by law: *nuncupative* and *formal*. A *nuncupative* will is an oral will declared by a testator before witnesses, and afterwards reduced to writing; it is valid when made by a soldier in actual military service—engaged in an expedition—or by a sailor at sea; or, in some States, by other people *in extremis* who are prevented from executing a formal will. Apart from these exceptional cases all wills must be in writing.

### A. IN ENGLAND.[3]

(*a*) No will is valid unless it be in writing, and signed at the foot or end thereof by the testator or some other person in his presence and by his direction, such signature being also made or acknowledged by him in the presence of two or more witnesses present at the same time, such witnesses attesting and subscribing the will in his presence. According to the new statute the incompetency of any attesting witness will not invalidate the will; yet any beneficial gift to an attesting witness, or to the husband or wife of an attesting witness, remains void.

(*b*) As to *revocation*, no will shall, under the new statute, be revoked by the *marriage alone* of a testator or testatrix. A revocation may, however, take place by the execution of another will or of a codicil, or of some written revocation executed like a will, or by the burning, tearing, or other destruction of the original will by the testator or by some person in his presence and by his direction;—obliteration and other alteration made after execution are of no effect, where the original meaning can still be deciphered, unless executed with the same formalities as the will itself, or unless the signature of the testator and the attest of the witnesses be made opposite or near the part altered, or at the foot or end of some memorandum in the will, and referring to the alteration.

(*c*) When a will is once revoked, it is not to be revived otherwise than by the reëxecution of the original, or by a codicil duly executed and declaring the intention of revival.

### B. IN THE UNITED STATES.

The same rules are substantially in force in the United States.

(*a*) In a very few States, however, *holograph* wills are allowed:

[3] Stephen, *l. c.*, pp. 551–554.

they must be entirely written, dated and signed by the testator's own hand, in which case no subscribing witnesses are required.

(*b*) But in most of the States two or three witnesses are required; any one may be a witness who is competent to give testimony, and who is not on the other hand beneficially interested in the will. If the will is not written by the testator, but by another, the latter shall write his own name as a witness in the presence of two other witnesses; besides this, the testator shall write his full name at the end of the will, or, if he does not know how to write, he will make a cross or any other mark. It is not necessary that the witnesses should know the contents of the will; but the testator must acknowledge his signature in their presence, and declare that the document is his last will and testament. Then the will is to be signed by them in presence of the testator and in the same room; in some States the simultaneous presence of all the witnesses is required. If the witnesses cannot sign, a cross or other mark will suffice. They should also write out their addresses, though this is not necessary for the validity of the testament. A *codicil*, *i. e.*, any modification of the will, is subject to the same legal forms as the will itself.

(*c*) As a rule a will is revoked by *marriage and the birth of a child* subsequent to the making of the will if the wife and child are wholly unprovided for; but marriage alone will not, in most of the States, nullify a will. It may be also revoked by the destruction of the original will, or the execution of another will as explained above.

### Executors or Administrators.

It is well for the testator to appoint an executor of the will, otherwise the Courts will provide for it by appointing an administrator. The appointment of an executor may be qualified by limitations as to time, place, and subject-matter, and the appointment may be conditional. As a rule, any one capable of making a will may be an executor. In some States, minors may be named as executors, but they cannot act if they are under twenty-one years of age when the testator dies. In most States, a single woman may now be an executor; and, under recent statutes, married women may likewise, in many States, act as executors, even without the assent of their husbands.

The duty of an executor, after attending to the decent burial of the deceased, is to have the will proved in the proper Court, and after probate to make an inventory of the property,[4] which must be filed within a stated period in the Register's office. Then he administers the property according to the directions of the will and the laws of the State. Where there is a deficiency of assets, if there are no directions in the will on the subject, personal property is generally to be used first to pay debts with, and real property afterwards.

He must pay the debts of the deceased, and observe the rules of priority, according to the several degrees which the law has established in this matter; next the *legatees* are to be paid.[5]

Executors or administrators are not allowed to retain a part of the revenue as a payment for their services, except by order of the Court.

### Practical Suggestions on the Making of a Will.

(*a*) If you are of age, and have any property of your own, make a will as soon as possible; else a part of your estate might be wasted in legal expenses. Do not put it off until you are dying; wills written when the testators are in extremity are often unsatisfactory, as important matters are likely to be forgotten, and suspicion of undue influence may be aroused.

(*b*) A will entirely of your own handwriting affords the best proof that it is genuine; but take heed that its legal expressions be sufficiently clear; hence, be not satisfied with reading the statute law of your own State on the matter of wills, but consult a lawyer and show him your draft. After your will has been prepared, think its provisions over for two or three days before executing it, provided of course you are not in danger of death.

(*c*) Write your will in a plain and clear style; if it is obscure, the Court may have difficulty in interpreting your intention. See

[4] By way of exception an inventory may not be necessary where the testator makes the executor the residuary legatee. But in this case, if there is not property enough to pay debts and legacies, the executor may have to pay them out of his own pocket.

[5] As for the order to be followed in the payment of debts and legacies, see *Stephen*, Vol. II, pp. 209–215; and, with regard to the United States, the various statutes.

that the words used by you not only convey your meaning, but that they convey no other meaning. If you make a detailed will, be careful in the description of the property devised to your legatees. When the will is written on several sheets of paper, it is safe to sign each sheet, the better to identify it.

(*d*) See whether, in case your legatee dies before you, you wish his children or other representatives to take his share, and express your intention clearly.

(*e*) Choose witnesses of character and good standing, clear-headed, honest, and disinterested, one or two more than the number strictly required, who are not your own legatees. Talk with them clearly and intelligently upon matters of local and personal interest, so as to impress upon them that you are perfectly sound of mind and free from all undue influence.

(*f*) When once your will has been executed, permit no alteration of any sort; but, if you have changed your mind, draw up a fresh document.

(*g*) Safeguard the instrument against destruction or alteration, and leave a sealed copy of it to a trustworthy friend.

## THE RIGHTS OF A PASTOR
(PAROCHUS)
## TO CONTROL HIS ASSISTANT.

*Qu.* I have in my parish a number of missions of English, German, and Bohemian nationality. The young people all speak English, of course. The bishop has given me an assistant who speaks both Bohemian and German, to whom I pay twenty-five dollars a month, besides furnishing board, etc. (The bishop had fixed the salary at twenty dollars a month.) Occasionally the societies celebrate the feasts of the Church according to their respective national customs, with special solemnity, and on these occasions I prefer to conduct the service. I do not ordinarily administer to these missions, not being sufficiently familiar with the foreign languages which the majority of the old people use. For this reason was the assistant given me.

What I wish to know is whether a pastor, under such circumstances, trespasses upon the rights of the assistant (who ordinarily ministers to these missions) if he assumes control of special celebrations of the sodalities and societies, etc., in his capacity as actual *parochus;* and

whether, if he for good reasons sees fit to refuse to recognize the independent arrangements of his assistant as to the manner and time of celebrating, he is within his right to do so. Could he for example celebrate the solemn Mass on such occasions and oblige the assistant to preach the sermon in the language of the people?

*Resp.* If the formal appointment to the missions made by the bishop distinctly stated that the assistant priest was to exercise exclusive *pastoral rights* over the mission stations, then he is pastor of the missions with residence at the principal parish house, whatever additional obligations may be put on him as assistant to the English-speaking pastor. But, from the fact that the salary is paid by the pastor of the principal church, which implies that the ordinary revenues from the missions are under the control of the latter, we would judge that no such rights of independent rectorship over the missions have been accorded the assistant priest. Canon law distinguishes between *vicarii administratores* and *vicarii coadjutores;* the former exercise quasi-ordinary jurisdiction and are in a manner independent pastors, but they require a definite appointment to this effect. Where such appointment is wanting, the pastor, who is the *vicarius curatus* and represents the bishop within the whole parish limits, has the right to reserve to himself the disposition and exercise of all solemn functions and he apportions likewise the duties of his assistants, whatever these may be, in regard to manner, place, and time, provided these dispositions are not contrary to the canons of the Church.

# Criticisms and Notes.

**HENRY THE THIRD AND THE CHURCH. A Study of his Ecclesiastical Policy and of the Relations between England and Rome. By Abbot Gasquet, D.D. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1905. Pp. xvi–445.**

Abbot Gasquet has managed by dint of laborious research into original and authentic documents, and by a frank and unbiased statement of the results, to gain a respectful hearing from those critics who are ordinarily disposed to judge matters of Catholic history from *a priori* conceived and one-sided points of view. This has so far effected a concession on the part of certain English writers in our day as to illumine by general consent a considerable portion of the hitherto obscured and so-called "Dark Ages," particularly respecting England. No epoch of history has been treated by historians with such unqualified bigotry and exaggerated misconception as the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. And the influence of these misconceptions has extended into all subsequent periods and given an apparent justification for the revolts of the sixteenth century against the authority of the Roman See, with all that such alienation from the head of the Catholic Church implies.

The position taken by the average popular historian of England's relations with the Holy See during the thirteenth century, starts with the assumption that the rupture between the Roman authorities and England was complete and justified by the actions of the Holy See, whose representatives assumed an authority over English sovereigns and the civil domain which no title could have sanctioned. Thus the Reformation, so far as it was a protest against papal abuses, is represented as having existed long before Luther and Henry VIII.

Abbot Gasquet examines the facts so far as they relate to the reign of Henry III, and by presenting us with unquestioned documentary evidence dissipates the prejudice that has obscured the attitude of King and Pope toward each other. He does not, indeed, free the representatives of Rome from blame where negligence and abuse show it to have existed, but he points out that the opposition to such abuses was not an opposition of the English government to the Papal authority, but a protest from clergy and people alike against unlawful methods of

Roman officialdom, with at the same time the plainest discrimination between the respect and obedience due by English Catholics to the Roman See in all spiritual matters. And here we have a vital distinction. Henry VIII as well as the German "reformers" uttered their discontent principally against the spiritual order of Rome, although no doubt temporal interests had prompted such an attitude; but the Catholic clergy and laity of England in the thirteenth century protested against temporal abuses, whilst they clearly distinguished between the loyalty due to the successor of St. Peter and the requirements of a feudal lord whose ministers might exercise unwarranted rule, without minimizing the actual rights of the Pope, whose sovereignty was conceded even in matters not exclusively spiritual.

Abbot Gasquet sums up the story of the reign of Henry III, so far as the Church is concerned, in the following sentences: "(1) The Pope, by the act of King John, had obtained a position of paramount importance in this country. What a suzerain was to a feudatory State, that the Pope of Rome was to England. The country was a fief of the Holy See; and the name of feudal overlord, possessed by the Pope, was no mere empty title, but represented a power which was acted upon and insisted upon again and again in spite of opposition. (2) This opposition was fully as strong, if not indeed stronger, on the part of the bishops and clergy, than it was on the side of the laity. (3) That there was grave discontent against the Roman officials cannot be doubted for one moment. In fact it could hardly have been deeper, and was manifested by ecclesiastics, if possible, even more than by laymen. (4) But it was a discerning discontent, and it was absolutely confined to opposition to the pecuniary policy of the papal officials in their constant demands made upon the revenues of the English churches and to the appointment of foreigners to English benefices. (5) Throughout the agitation — and it was both considerable and extending over a long period of time—not only was there no attack made upon the spiritual supremacy of the popes, but that supremacy over the Church Universal was assumed in every document emanating from England, and this spiritual supremacy was constantly asserted to have been established by Christ Himself." Our author, reminding his readers by constant reference to the original documents, shows how much the spiritual side of the papacy is invariably insisted on in unmistakable terms. Men who, like Grosseteste, were the most determined in their opposition to what might be called the claims of the papacy in temporal matters, were, like him, the most clear-sighted in

their perception of the Pope's indefeasible and divine right and duty to rule the Universal Church in matters spiritual. "In fact, Grosseteste even went beyond this, and fully conceded to the Apostolic See in theory the power of dealing out to whom it would the ecclesiastical benefices of this or any other country. 'I know and truly acknowledge,' he says, 'that to the lord pope and the holy Roman Church belongs the power of dealing freely with all ecclesiastical benefices'[1] throughout the world. This is an important declaration on the Catholic theory of papal authority; whilst the whole of the bishops' acts are a practical protest against local abuses of that power."

Incidentally Dom Gasquet shows how much England actually owes of its present independence to the forethought and protection of the popes. "England might, and in all probability would, have become a feudatory State under the French crown, or it may be an outlying part of the German Empire," etc., is not a mere vague supposition, but a deduction from facts abundantly attested by the evidence which the learned Benedictine here brings to bear on his main argument.

**THE NEW YORK REVIEW. A Journal of the Ancient Faith and Modern Thought. June—July, 1905. St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York. Vol. I, No. 1. Pp. 132.**

We have already expressed our appreciation of the first issue of the *New York Review*, in the August number of THE DOLPHIN. What we said there we repeat in speaking to priests who are even more familiar with our needs in the field of high-class Catholic literature than are the laity, and who are likely to appreciate every new effort to raise the standard and extend the literary scope of religious, intellectual, and apologetic activity in our ranks.

The special aim of the New York magazine is, as we said in THE DOLPHIN, to bring into prominence the true achievements of modern scientific thought, and to show how far they are in accord with the unchanging principles of the Christian faith. The purpose is well expressed in the subtitle,—"a journal of the ancient faith and modern thought," and readers who happen to study THE DOLPHIN will there find an article—the beginning of a *series* of studies on the same subject—which shows how carefully we must steer in this matter, and how zealous it behooves us to be in its pursuit at the same time. It may be argued that a new magazine of this kind simply reasserts a programme already established by such high-class periodicals as the

[1] Grosseteste: *Epistolae*, 145.

*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, or *The Catholic University Bulletin*, which does in particular and necessarily cultivate this same field of the theological and philosophical disciplines. We should say the same of that well-conducted elder European Quarterly, *The Dublin Review*, not to mention THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN, or the London *Month*, which in the twelve numbers of their annual issues bring, among other varied matter, practically as many articles of an apologetic and scientific character as any of the above; yet even if this were true, the establishment of a periodical such as the *New York Review* promises to be, would be amply justified in its appeal to the scholarly or educated reader in English-speaking countries.

In the first place it concentrates the talent which is formed in, and gathered around, an important educational establishment such as the Dunwoodie Seminary of New York. It is not enough to educate such talent; you must give it room for useful intellectual activity, a tangible purpose, a bond of common interests, the prospects of results which tell upon the progress of the home forces, and create an *esprit de corps*. All this can not be accomplished in the same measure if the scholarship of the New York Seminary had not the stimulus of a separate organ of expression, which stood forth as distinct as does the Seminary itself, and does not merge its forces into those of other literary organs, for the same reason that our bishops do not send their students all to one large Theological Seminary which might be established with less cost to the individual but with at the same time superior equipment of teaching staff and appointments.

In the next place it may be assumed that a well-conducted magazine entering a field in which others are already engaged in the same or similar purpose, is bound not only to stimulate general excellence, but to multiply the means of information. Competition is the life of progress, and the multiplying of vehicles is a suggestion to many to ride who would otherwise walk. To say that too many laborers in the same field hamper each other and must find it impossible to cultivate a living out of the limited ground which the subscription list of the educated reading public affords, is to mistake the point of view from which the Catholic editor and publisher should approach their work; and it is also to mistake the effect which competition produces on the subscribing public. If the field is not broad enough for so many to extend their labor, let them dig deeper; there is room in the mines below as yet untouched, as there is room for excellence on top; and in

the present rating of values it is better to dig gold than to plow for corn. Furthermore, the educated man or woman who reads one high-class magazine is apt to read two or three, if they are equally good, since they are apt to offer variety of topics apart from a certain individuality of treatment possessed by any well-managed publication.

We have then good reason to welcome the *New York Review* even as a competitor. Its mission is not, and cannot be, merely one of a mercantile enterprise. There is no money in such undertakings, except what the publisher spends at this stage of our Catholic educational progress; and the glory of being nobly unselfish in battling with manifold difficulties as editors or publishers of high-class literature must be supported by other and stronger motives if it is to last. In five or ten years such an undertaking as the *New York Review* will make its expenses, and then, if it has been uniformly well-managed, at that time it will begin to inspire confidence and do more. This prophecy rests on observation and some personal experience.

The present number of the *New York Review* contains two articles by non-American writers and six by American priests, among whom Fathers McSorley and Gigot are probably best known to the general reading world as well-informed critics,—one particularly in the field of psychology, the other in Sacred Scripture. Father Gigot's "Studies on the Synoptics" reveal, indeed, thorough scholarship. He examines the account of the synoptics dealing with the preparatory ministry of St. John the Baptist, and establishes the conclusion that St. Matthew's Gospel record depends upon the Gospel of St. Mark, and that St. Luke had before him both accounts; he points out, too, that this mutual dependence may be traced throughout the entire narrative of our Lord's public life. Father Driscoll's first paper is a brief introduction to a comparative view of the various recent theories on the subject of "Biblical Inspiration." The writer's sympathies thus far indicate a leaning toward Père Lagrange's views, although one notes with pleasure that mention is made of our Jesuit Father, Anthony Maas, who differs from the great Dominican, and whose modesty only prevents his being heralded as one of our leading and best-informed Biblical scholars. In this connection we might mention also an appreciative review of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Father Oussani, which offers much information and places the work as midway between "the overstrict conservatism" of Vigouroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible* and the ultra-radicalism of Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Dr. Duffy, not quite so scientific a writer, makes a plea for the moral conscience

of man as superior to the kosmos. His language is choice and his style clear and entertaining. The same may be said of Father Clifford's review of Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, which adds the critical note and makes Dr. Holtzmann's friends smart with the exposition of his easy-going logic. Father McSorley plays deftly upon his favorite harp, which was once the harp of his master, Father Hecker. "The Church and the Soul" reads like a chapter from, or rather an introduction to, "The Aspirations of the Soul." Altogether one may form a good estimate of what the projectors of the *New York Review* have in mind to do.

We note that there is no *censor* mentioned in connection with the magazine, such as the Index rules demand, and as is customarily noted upon the cover of European magazines issued under ecclesiastical auspices. This means probably that the Archbishop of New York confides in the orthodoxy and propriety of the utterances of the publication under the editorship of the rector of St. Joseph's Seminary. St. Sulpice stands for a high and untarnished expression of the ecclesiastical spirit and scholarship.

H.

**LE BON PASTEUR. Conferences sur les obligations de la Charge Pastorale. Par Mgr. Lelong, Evêque de Nevers. Second Edition. Paris: Ancienne Maison Ch. Douniol (P. Téqui, Libraire-editeur). 1905. Pp. 511.**

The Bishop of the ancient diocese of Nevers, whose records of saintly rulers and martyrs go back to the fifth century, has illustrated the pastoral zeal of which he speaks in this volume by several works of similar trend,—*Le Saint Prêtre* and *La Sainte Religieuse;* they are two works which bear the stamp of a mind at home in the regions of practical as well as spirtual or contemplative religious life.

Bishop Lelong has himself given for years the spiritual retreats to his clergy. He knows the needs of his diocese, and he feels them. His words come therefore with the earnestness of a pastor anxious for the welfare of his flock. If he instructs and admonishes, it is not in the stereotyped fashion of an ascetic writer or preacher who sets forth the virtues of the ecclesiastical state and the necessity of pious reflection and devotion. He rather reviews the actual duties involved in the pastoral charge. The love which a pastor owes to his people must be active, persevering, self-sacrificing. This implies that he live in his parish, labor in it and for it without assuming any other burdens that might weaken his capacity, or alienate his interest from the

demands of his parish. To work effectually in his home for the good of his people the priest requires certain helps; these are found in the appointments of his pastoral residence, in the members of his household, his assistant priests, and those whom he may select as co-laborers among the laity. Prayer, study, dress, manners, the working methods at home, in the church, and outside it in the homes of his people,—all these things are discussed in an attractive and practical way. The chapters on Catechism, the Training of Children, First Communion, the Confessional, Sick-calls are particularly good. Some of the things referred to are of course applicable directly only to France and French conditions of life, but it is easy for any reader to separate the principle from the accidentals, and to find very useful hints in the Bishop's suggestions regarding intercourse with the civil authorities, the management of confraternities, and such other circumstances of the pastoral life, in which conditions alter the application of the general principle of utility and prudence. Books of this sort cannot be regarded as repetitions of old themes; they are always useful and need to be ever read with renewed attention.

**THE RELIGIOUS STATE OF CATHOLIC COUNTRIES NO PREJUDICE TO THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH. By John Henry Cardinal Newman. Educational Briefs No. 11, July, 1905. Pp. 36. (Catholic School Board, Philadelphia).**

Few of us in practical converse with men of the world, often earnest Protestants, have not felt some difficulty when confronted with the request to explain the existence of certain salient defects in the social and moral conditions of people in Catholic countries as compared with those of Protestant lands. The traveller, the student of statistics, the moral philosopher, have each an account of levities and sins, of crimes and of ignorances tolerated if not endorsed by authority in Latin countries where the Catholic religion has held almost exclusive sway for centuries, indicating a low degree and little esteem of certain industrial virtues, of self-respect, temperance, and popular intellectual culture. We may perhaps be inclined to deny the fact, when it is urged that Catholic countries are so far behind the rest of the world in the arts and comforts of life, in power of political combination, in civil economy, and the social virtues, in a word in all that tends to make the world pleasant and the loss of it painful, that their religion cannot come from above. Now before the argument could be made to tell against us, proof must be furnished, not only that the fact is

as stated, but also that there is that essential connection in the nature of things between true religion and secular perfection. As to the facts, we are rarely in position to convince a critic who judges merely from outward impressions of the things he sees and hears, that he is not right when he holds that invention, common school education, practical arts, civil and national prosperity, flourish better in England, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, than in Italy, France, Spain, and South America, which are taken to be distinctly Catholic countries. In these cases the actual facts do not always lie on the surface, and they require to be closely examined and verified, to test the value of statistics which demonstrate so often the very opposite of what the names and figures suggest.

But even if we granted the claims of observation and analysis, we shall find the deduction to be wholly misleading when it is made to show that the deficiencies of Catholic nations are due to or in any sense a fruit of the Church's teaching. This is what Cardinal Newman points out and clearly demonstrates in his Lectures entitled *Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*. The essays first appeared fifty years ago, but their reasoning is as valid in our day as it is needed to confute the ever-reviving prejudices and misconceptions, even among our educated classes, about the influences of the Catholic Church. In the present essay, which confines itself to the question of the Church's sanctity and its influence upon the *religious* as distinct from the *social* condition of Catholic countries, we have the explanation of what so often offends the Protestant visitor, namely, that familiar handling of sacred things, that mixture of seriousness and levity in word and deed, by good and bad, where Catholics live under the impressions created by a common faith. The author shows how faith, and the love which should go to enliven it, are separable ; how, although faith *should* inspire our affections and control the direction of our will power, it does not of necessity do so. But he also shows how much nearer the Catholic finds himself by his very faith and knowledge of good to the doing of it when a crisis demands from him a decisive and heroic act for which the religious doctrine of private judgment could never fit a soul, although Protestantism might smooth the ways of this world to temporal success. Father Philip McDevitt has with admirable judgment selected the various themes for the publication of his "Educational Briefs," which promise to become a valuable reference library of Catholic pedagogical thought. These neat pamphlets are in the first place intended to instruct and guide the Catholic teachers of the Archdiocese

of Philadelphia; but they should have a much wider circulation as representing the best helps for creating a healthy atmosphere for the formation of just judgments on historical and philosophical topics which concern our teachers everywhere.

---

# Amoenitates Pastorales.

A Protestant clergyman once, in introducing his wife to a Catholic prelate, facetiously quoted the phrase in which Touchstone introduces Audrey in Shakespeare's *As You Like It:* "Allow me to present my wife—a poor thing, sir, but mine own."

The good lady resented her husband's somewhat infelicitous jest, and being a woman of spirit, immediately turned and said: "Allow me to present my husband—a poorer thing, sir, but mine owner!"

---

A learned clergyman was talking with an illiterate preacher who professed to despise education.

"You have been to college, I suppose?" asked the latter.

"I have, sir," was the curt answer.

"I am thankful," said the ignorant one, "that the Lord has opened *my* mouth to preach without learning."

"A similar event occurred in Balaam's time," was the retort.

---

Mrs. O'Rourke is in straitened circumstances and the priest bids his housekeeper to give her a goose sent him for his Thanksgiving dinner. The old lady acknowledges the gift by saying: "Long life to yer rivirince; sure I'll niver see a goose agin but I'll think of yez."

---

*The Religious Telescope* defines a poor sermon as one of which it is said: "It is just splendid, and could not possibly offend anybody, no matter what his religious views might be."

---

To the rude question of a dissipated passenger on board ship, "Why do you wear that thing?" (a cross), an Australian bishop replied, "For the same reason that you wear a red nose—as a mark of my occupation."

A lady of Somerset bewailed the loss of a somewhat ill-bred but extremely wealthy neighbor, who had been very liberal in his help to her country charities. "Mr. X. is dead," said she. "He was so good, and kind, and helpful to me in all sorts of ways. He was so vulgar, poor, dear fellow, we could not know him in London; but we shall meet him in heaven."

---

Deacon Yourpocket comes to a certain English actor, whose debts had made him an object of interest to various bailiffs, and asks him if he could spare $5 toward a fund with which to bury a bailiff who had just died.

"By all means," replied the actor; "here's $10—bury two."

---

The Rev. Dr. Fourthly (who has been invited to occupy the pulpit on the morning in question): "At what point in the service, brother, do you take up the collection?"

The Rev. K. Mowatt Laightly: "O, we don't do that any more at all! Some of the contributions might be morally tainted."

---

The son of a tailor named Berry, who had lived in Fr. X's parish for many years, succeeded to his father's business on the death of the latter. Being in want of money he sent a bill for a coat the priest had ordered, before the garment had been delivered. Whereupon the pastor wrote the following note to the young Berry: "You must be a goose—Berry, to send me your bill—Berry, before it is due—Berry. Your father, the elder—Berry, would have had more sense. You may look very black—Berry, and feel very blue—Berry, but I don't care a straw—Berry, for you and your bill—Berry."

---

The following is given as authentic by a staff reporter of the London *Spectator*. In a hotel in a certain town in Ireland the porter, dutifully in furtherance of the interests of his employers, remarked, "If you want a drive, sir, you needn't go out of the hotel," meaning, of course, that carriages formed part of the establishment. In the same place the stranger incidentally overheard a conversation between two workmen. One put the question. "Were you acquainted with So-and-So?" to which the reply was, "No; he was dead before I knew him."

---

Acting as judge in a dispute between two of his parishioners, the

priest asked, "But you know that Tim Conroy who you say assaulted you is blind, or is as good as blind?" "Yes, Sir." "Then how came he to get into the scrimmage?" "Well, yer Reverence, it wos this way. Wherever he heard the blows goin' he slipped in, feelin' for a vacancy, and when he found it, he let fly like a good wan." "But you said just now that there was a storm of thunder and lightning going on at the time." "There was so, yer Reverence." "Then I suppose it got darker and darker?" "Thrue for you!" "And you say this man was nearly blind; surely the darkness would have made him quite so?" "Not at all, Sir. Contrariwise, every time a flash of lightnin' come he shthruck out and hit me in the eye." "It was raining too, I suppose?" "It was so, yer Reverence!" "Perhaps, then, as you are so exact, you'll tell the size of the drops of rain." "I will thin; to the best of me rec'llection they varied in size from a shilling to eighteenpence!"

This hazy view of the size of drops of rain is somewhat suggestive of a drop too much of another sort, and recalls another story whose absurdity is due to the provision of a drop too little, or rather a drop of the wrong sort. A priest who is a total abstainer was expecting his cousin, a Dublin solicitor, on a visit, and knowing that he did not hold the same views as himself on the Drink question, went to the village grocer and ordered a bottle of port. This was duly delivered and decanted by his Reverence. At dinner time he hospitably poured out a glass and said: "There, Cousin Tom, that's the best vintage Ballyporeen affords." The solicitor sipped it critically, and then said: "Well, Cousin Cornelius, to my mind it tastes a wee bit too much of the musheruins (mushrooms)." It proved to be ketchup.

---

# Literary Chat.

Father Wasmann, the eminent Jesuit scientist whose writings on animal physiology and on biology command the respect of learned men throughout the world, has been recently made the object of a singular and somewhat ambiguous eulogy on the part of Professor Haeckel, of Jena, whose well-known extreme interpretations of the so-called Darwinian theory have made his name a by-word for scientific atheism. Professor Haeckel, in a series of University lectures, announced to his hearers that there was preparing a grand movement in the Catholic Church, under the leadership of the Jesuits, toward accepting the modern (that is, the Darwinian) theory of evolution; and that the signal for this compromise on the part of the Church and the

Jesuits had been given by Fr. Wasmann in a recently published volume (of which a critique appeared in our pages) entitled *Die Moderne Biologie und die Entwickelungstheorie* (B. Herder, Freiburg, Brisg.). Father Wasmann not only declines the compliment, but exposes and ably refutes the loose reasoning and biased assumptions of the Jena professor; this he does in an "Open Letter," which appeared in the *Germania* (Berlin) newspaper, the efficient organ of the German Catholics, which as a "daily" (with several editions) does valiant work of religious apologetic and polemic defence in the fatherland similar to that which the *Tablet* does as a "weekly" for England.

---

Father George Tyrrell, S.J., author of *Lex Orandi*, begins a new series of articles in THE DOLPHIN for October under the title of "The Spirit of Christ."

An able Catholic critic recently said of him: "There is no single writer in England at this day who wields so powerful, so deeply spiritual, and so keenly philosophical a pen as Father Tyrrell. At the same time his language is so choice and accurate, his style so musical and elevated, that it is difficult not to be carried away by his searching and harmonious reasoning, albeit he uproots with merciless logic some of our cherished and sweetly benumbing traditions in matters of the spiritual life."

---

The devotion of the Holy Ghost is receiving a new impulse in the United States. The Hon. Judge Frank McGloin, of New Orleans, whose recently published volume, *The Light of Faith*, we briefly commented on in THE DOLPHIN, is making active propaganda for the Society of the Holy Ghost, established in his city about twenty-four years ago. The particular work to which Judge McGloin devotes his energies is the promulgation of Catholic literature in the form of tracts distributed free and in large quantities at the public thoroughfares and railway stations. The work differs from that of the Truth Society in this, that it does not confine itself to reprinting pamphlets and books which can be read only by comparatively few, but it prints leaflets which attract the attention of the curious and scatter the seeds of truth before the feet of the busy worker in the mart.

---

It is probably not generally known that the originator of the devotion to the Holy Ghost, which was established in England through the efforts of Father Rawes, O.S.C., of Bayswater, and Cardinal Manning, and obtained the Pontifical approval as a canonical Confraternity by Rescript of Leo XIII, in 1878, owes its origin to Mrs. E. M. Shapcote, the author of numerous writings dealing with the subject of mystic theology, especially in its relation to the Holy Eucharist and Our Blessed Lady. Mrs. Shapcote, known also by her writings on religious topics as Sr. M. Theresa, Tertiary O.S.D., is a convert whose remarkable history we hope to be allowed to publish later on for the edification of our readers.

---

The *Cenacle* is the title of a series of fifty short meditations on the "Holy Spirit and His Gifts," published by the Carmelites (Angel Guardian Press) of Boston. The work, composed in 1671, by the Procurator General of the Discalced Carmelites, was originally written in Italian, although the first known copy of it during the present century was a German translation. It is well suited for reflections covering a ten days' retreat in honor of the Holy Spirit.

"Many people come to history to find evidence of something they wish to prove," writes Abbot Gasquet in the preface to his latest volume on *Henry the Third and the Church*. "Their eyes consequently magnify what they expect to see, whilst probably quite unconsciously they obscure, or diminish, or discount what does not accord with their preconceived notions." This is true in regard to facts, but it is also and even more true with respect to inferences and deductions which have to be drawn from them in order to explain their existence or to point their moral. Dom Gasquet's book is especially remarkable in this that it sets forth the historical motives which allow us to distinguish between the claims of the Papacy as a temporal and as a spiritual power.

---

The appearance of the second edition of the first volume of P. Denifle's *Luther und Lutherthum*, of which he completed the revision only in part, demonstrates, despite the criticisms which the work created among the defenders of the German reformer, how eagerly the volume has been read. The second part which now issues from the press (Kirchheim) deals with the cardinal doctrine of "justification," and is a serious contribution not only to the history of Biblical exegesis but also to that of dogmatic theology, inasmuch as the eminent Dominican sets forth the patristic and concordant traditional views of the mediæval teachers up to the time of Luther. This departure is intended to place in their proper light the theological opinions of the "reformers," and it shows how little they respected the authority of the great minds who formulated the conciliar decisions of the previous ages for the doctrinal guidance of the faithful. The third part (of volume I in second edition) is in press, and will appear by the end of the year. It has been considerably amplified.

---

# Books Received.

## BIBLICAL.

LEXICON BIBLICUM. Editore Martino Hagen, S.J. Volumen Primum: A to C. Cursus Scripturae Sacrae. Auctoribus R. Cornely, J. Knabenbauer, Fr. de Hummelauer, aliisque Soc. Jesu presbyteris. S. P. Pius X ut Sanctitati Suae opus hoc dedicaretur, benigne concessit. Parisiis: 10, via dicta "Cassette": P. Lethielleux. 1905. Pp. ii—1039.

DIE MESSIANISCHEN VORBILDER IM ALTEN TESTAMENT. Ein Beitrag für den Religionsunterricht. Von Dr. Hugo Weiss, Ord. Professor der Theologie am Königl. Lyceum Hosianum zu Braunsberg. Freiburg im Breisgau, Wien, Strassburg, München, und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1905. Pp. 100. Price, $0.95, *net*.

DAS COMMA IOANNEUM. Auf Seine Herkunft Untersucht. Von Dr. Karl Künstle, A. O. Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. Br. Freiburg im Breisgau, Wien, Strassburg, München, und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1905. Pp. 64. Price, $0.80, *net*.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. Catholic Scripture Manuals. With Introduction and Annotations, by Madame Cecilia, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham, S. W. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., Ltd. 1904. Pp. 494. Price, $1.25.

## THEOLOGICAL.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By the Rt. Rev. Wm. Stang, D.D., Bishop of Fall River. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. 207.

DAS KATHOLISCHE KIRCHENJAHR. Betrachtungen über das Leben unseres Herrn Jesus Christus des Sohnes Gottes. Von Moritz Meschler, S.J. Two Volumes. Freiburg im Breisgau, Wien, Strassburg, München, und St. Louis, Mo. : B. Herder. 1905. Pp., Vol. I, 380; Vol. II, 459. Price, two volumes, $2.75.

DIE CHRISTLICHE EHE. Drei Vorträge. Von Dr. C. P. Bruehl. Manayunk, Pa.: Reichert Print. Pp. 24.

IS THERE SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CHURCH? By the Right Rev. Mgr. Canon John Vaughan. Brooklyn: International Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 16. Price, $0.05 each; $3.00 per hundred.

DE MINUSPROBABILISMO seu de Usu Opinionis quam quis solide sed minus Probabilem esse iudicet. Auctore Ludovico Wouters, C.SS.R., Theologiae Moralis Professore. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. 1905. Pp. 127. Price, $0.55, *net*.

LIBERTAD RELIGIOSA Y LIBERTAD DE ENSENANZA. Por Francisco J. Zavala, Guadalajara, Mexico: Imp. de *El Regional*. 1905. Pp. 98.

NOTES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By the Most Rev. Edward G. Bagshawe, D.D., Archbishop of Seleucia. Second edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 287. Price, $1.35, *net*.

## DEVOTIONAL.

THE SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE, and The Life of Sacrifice, in the Religious State. From the Original of the Rev. S. M. Giraud, Missionary Priest of Our Lady of La Salette. Revised by the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. 500. Price, $2.00 *net*.

THE MIRROR OF ST. EDMUND. Done into Modern English by Francesca M. Steele. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. 1905. Pp. 80. Price, $0.80 *net*.

THE SAINT OF THE EUCHARIST: ST. PASCHAL BABYLON. Patron of Eucharist Associations. Adapted from the French of the Most Rev. Fr. Louis Antoine de Porrentruy, Definitor General of the Order of Friars Minor Capuchins, by Fr. Oswald Staniforth, O.M.Cap. Mendocino, Cal.: St. Anthony's Mission. 1905.

THE CENACLE. Retreat of Ten Days Preparatory to the Coming of the Holy Spirit into our Souls. Fifty Meditations on the Holy Spirit and His Gifts, collected in 1696 and presented in this form by the Discalced Carmelites for their Spiritual Exercises. Translated from the French of the Abbé L. G., by the Carmelites of Boston. Boston: Carmelite Convent, and Guardian Angel Press. 1905. Pp. 198.

DIE HEILIGE KOMMUNION. Das kostbarste Geschenk des Herzens Jesu. Belehrung und Gebete. Von P. Franz Hattler, S.J. Zweite vermehrte Auflage. Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch. 1904. Pp. 343. Price, $0.90.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. Pastoral Letter of the Rt. Rev. James A. McFaul, D.D., Bishop of Trenton. Second Edition. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. 32. Price, $0.10.

THE CROSS AND PASSION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Meditations and Prayers. Compiled by W. Thornton Parker, M.D., Order of the Brothers of the Crucifix. Northampton, Mass.: The Northampton Press. 1905. Pp. 48.

DER RÖMISCHE KATECHISMUS. Nach dem Beschlusse des Konzils von Trient, für die Pfarrer auf Befehl des Papstes Pius des Fünften herausgegeben. Unter Zugrundelegung der Ausgabe des Textes und der Uebersetzung von Kanonikus Dr. Smets bezw. Professor Dr. Adolf Buse. Vierte verbesserte Auflage. Lateinisch und Deutsch. Erster Band und Zweiter Band. Regensburg, Rom, New York, und Cincinnati: Friedrich Pustet. 1905. Pp., Erster Band (Lateinisch) x—286, (Deutsch) xx—286; Zweiter Band (Lateinisch) 217, (Deutsch) 217. Price, $2.50 *net.*

## LITURGICAL.

MASS IN HONOR OF ST. AUGUSTIN (Missa in honorem Sancti Augustini). By Max Hohnerlein. Fischer's Edition, No. 2721, Op. 40a, for three male voices, with organ accompaniment; No. 2722, Op. 40b, for alto, tenor, and baritone (or bass), with organ accompaniment. New York: J. Fischer & Bro.; London: The Vincent Music Company, Ltd.; Augsburg: A. Boehm & Son. 1905. Price, No. 2721, score, $0.80; voice parts, $0.60; No. 2722, score, $0.80; voice parts, $0.60.

MESSE SOLENNELLE. For four mixed voices, with organ or orchestra accompaniment. By Giuseppe Ferratta. Opus 15. Fischer's Edition, No. 2719. New York: J. Fischer & Bro.; London: The Vincent Music Company, Ltd. 1905. Price, $0.80.

MESSE EN SI BÉMOL, à quatre voix d'hommes avec accompagnement de l'orgue. Par Bruno Oscar Klein. Op. 85. Fischer's Edition, No. 2749. New York: J. Fischer & Bro.; London: The Vincent Music Company, Ltd. 1905. Price, score, $0.80; voice parts, $1.20.

DOWNSIDE MASSES. A Collection of Masses by Masters of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Cary Edition, Nos. 816, 823 to 827. No. 816, Casciolini's Mass in A minor, for four voices, edited from a Roman MS., with *Benedictus* added; No. 823, Simple Mass for four voices, by Antonio Lotti; No. 824, Mass for four mixed voices, by Piedro Heredia; No. 825, Viadana's Mass or L'Hora Passa, for four voices; No. 826, Hasler's Mass ("Dixit Maria"); No. 827, Mass "Quinti Toni," by Orlando di Lasso. The above Masses are edited by R. R. Terry, Musical Dirctor, Westminster Cathedal. London: Cary & Co.; New York: J. Fischer & Bro. 1905. Price, each Mass, score, 1*s.* 6*d.*

RITUS CONSECRATIONIS ECCLESIAE. Nach dem Römischen Pontificale für den Gebrauch des assistierenden Klerus. Regensburg, Rom, New York und Cincinnati: Friedrich Pustet. 1905. Pp. 71. Price, $0.25.

RITUS CONSECRATIONIS ALTARIS. Nach dem Römischen Pontificale für den Gebrauch des assistierenden Klerus. Regensburg, Rom, New York und Cincinnati: Friedrich Pustet. 1905. Pp. 48. Price, $0 20.

## HISTORICAL.

INTRODUCTORY HISTORY OF IRELAND. By an Irish Priest. Arlington, N. J.: Catholic Protectory Print. 1905. Pp. 39. Price, $0.15, postpaid.

HENRY THE THIRD AND THE CHURCH. A Study of his Ecclesiastical Policy and the Relations between England and Rome. By Abbot Gasquet, D.D. London: George Bell and Sons; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1905. Pp. xvi—445. Price, 1*s.* 6*d.*

REMINISCENCES OF AN OBLATE OF ST. CHARLES. By the Rev. Francis J. Kirk, Oblate of St. Charles. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. 1905. Pp. 111. Price, $0.75 *net.*

ST. PETER FOURIER. By L. Pingaud. Translated by "C. W. W." London: Duckworth & Co.; Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son; New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. 194. Price, $1.00 *net.*